



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

Can 2.2

Harvard College Library



ADDED TO THE
**PARKMAN COLLECTION OF
CANADIAN HISTORY**

BY GIFT OF
CLARANCE MACDONALD WARNER

A MONTHLY
REVIEW

THE BYSTANDER

OF
CURRENT EVENTS,
CANADIAN AND GENERAL.

NEW SERIES.

OCTOBER, 1889,
TO
SEPTEMBER, 1890.

Toronto:
HUNTER, ROSE & COMPANY.
1890.

Can 2,2



Entered according to Act of Parliament of Canada, in the year one thousand eight hundred and ninety (for the Proprietor), by GRAEME MERORE ADAM, in the office of the Minister of Agriculture.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
CANADIAN AFFAIRS .		Confederation, Australian and	
Affray Among the Dailies..	145	Canadian.....	348
Anti-British Feeling Among		Conflict in the North-West.	13
Canadians.....	87	Constitutional Law.....	7
Attitude of Our Government		Copyright Legislation.....	68
on the Tariff.....	379	Corruption, Sir Richard Cart-	
Australian and Canadian Con-		wright on	85
federation	348	Cost of the Parliament Build-	
		ings	276
Bank Reports and the Com-		Depreciation in Farm Pro-	
mmercial Outlook.....	315	perty.....	384
Banks and the Government,		Detective Service, The.....	228
The.....	187	Dilke, Sir C., on Canada..	213
Benwell Murder, The...227, 247		Dissolutions, Parliamentary..	82
Book-Publishing, Question-		----- Prerogative of.	289
able Methods of.....2, 299		----- Premature	380
Canada, Sir Charles Dilke		Dual Language Debate, The	181
on	213, 268	----- in the North-	
----- Quarterly Review on..	284	West	140
Canadian Art...132,270,300, 335		Education Report, The.....	267
----- and Australian Con-		Effects of the Equal Rights	
federation.....	348	Agitation.....	8
----- Literature..71, 104, 136		Equal Rights Movement...1, 41	
----- Nationality.....	77	----- on the Platform	275
----- Parties	18	----- In Society.....	163
----- Railways.....	311	Events in Journalism.....	343
Cartwright, Sir R., on Cor-		Exodus, The.....	
ruption.....	85	----- and Mr. Charlton..	185
Chances of Escape from Party		Federations, Australian and	
Government.....	276	Canadian....	348
Charlton, Mr., and the Ex-		----- Possible and Im-	
odus.....	185	possible.....	220
Commercial Union.....	146	Fisheries Question, The	284
----- and Gen. Wilson ..	219	Flags on Public Schools, The	217
----- Situation, The....	382	Formation of Third Parties .	138

	PAGE		PAGE
Forest Destruction	316	Meredith, Mr., and Education	143
Franciscans, The.....	345	Middleton, General, the Case	
Gentlemen Emigrants	228	of.....	288, 318
Grosswell's Canada.....	335	Parting Address..	388
Harvey Murder Case, The...	88	Military Anniversaries.....	319
High Schools, The Ontario..	387	Mining, Report of in Ontario	282
Imperial Federation in The		Miracles in Quebec.....	346
Senate.....	178	Modern Language Associa-	
Independence and the Young		tion, The.....	164
Liberals	177	Mormonism in the North-	
Jesuits Estates' Act, The....	5	West.....	86
Journalism, Events in.....	343	Mortgage Debt in Ontario..	385
Kingsford's Canadian History	170	Municipal Taxation in On-	
Large Farms in the North-		tario.....	239
West.....	56	New Native Industry, A....	212
Last Session, The.....	278	North-West, Dual Language	140
Libel Suits	387	The Settling of..	224
Liberal Leadership, The.141,	337	Representation..	225
Lincoln Election, The	286	and Manitoba..	111
Localism in Elections	245	Mormonism in..	86
Lorne, Lord, as a Novelist..	169	and the Tariff,	
Loyalty Resolution, The....	172	The.....	34
Manitoba and the North-		Ontario, Contest in.....	107
West.....	3, 111	Elections.....	305
and our Tariff....	211	Mining, Report of..	282
and Ottawa.....	322	Parties in..191, 244,	342
Peopling of.....	285	Taxation in.....	239
Political Awakening	347	Opening of the Session.....	137
Politics in.....	191	Parliament Buildings, Cost of	276
Railway Monopoly	87	Parliamentary Dissolutions..	82
School Bill.....	226	Party Government, Chances	
Masson's North-West Fur		of Escape from.....	276
Traders.....	171	Parties in Ontario..191, 244,	342
Mercier Banquet, The.....	339	Peopling of Manitoba.....	285
Mr., Recent Speeches	73	Politics in Manitoba.....	191
Meredith, Mr., Position of..	142	Political Awakening in Mani-	
and the Contest		toba.....	347
in Ontario....	107	Political Situation, The....	105
		Poole's Anglo-Israel.....	134

CONTENTS.

V

	PAGE		PAGE
Possible and Impossible Fed- eration.....	220	Temperance Question, The..	48
Prerogative of Dissolution ..	289	Third Seat for Toronto, The.	343
Press, The, and the Benwell Murder.....	247	Third Parties, Formation of.	138
Priests in Politics.....	346	Titles of Honour.....	143
Professor of Philosophy, The New.....	165	Toronto Carnival, The.	349
Protectionism.....	279	—— Anglican Jubilee....	114
Prospects of Reciprocity....	80	—— Growth of.....	113
Provincial Elections, The...	273	—— Magnates and the Esplanade	246
Public Parks	350	—— Third Seat for.....	343
Public School Expenditure..	317	—— University.....	206, 240
Quarterly Review, The, on Canada.....	284	Two Premiers, The.	341
Quebec Elections, The.....	308	Two Races, The.....	11
—— Miracles in.....	346	University, Burning of The..	206
Questions before the Country	1	—— Admission to....	206
Railway Monopoly in Mani- toba.....	87	—— Confederation...	39
Reciprocity.....	53, 80	—— Professorships...	40
Religious Toleration.....	44	—— Quarterly Review	254
Rideau Hall.....	221	Use of the Veto, The.....	83
Roman Catholicism v. Jesuit- ism.....	110	West Lambton Election, The	84
Rome and Education.....	15	Whither are We Tending ?..	179
Royal Society of Canada, Meeting of	290	Wilson, General, and Com- mercial Union.....	219
Rykert Case, The	223	Women and the Medicoes, The.....	221
—— Letters, The.....	187	Young Liberals, The, and Independence.....	177
Salaries and Nepotism.....	386	AMERICAN AFFAIRS :	
Senate, The, as a Political Reality.....	185	A Paradise for Workmen	296
Separate Schools.....	17, 243	An American on the French Revolution	61
Settling The North-West...	224	American Elections.....	89
Stanstead Election, The	109	—— Nationalization...	308
Sunday Street Cars.....	37	Anglophobia.....	367
Surrendering to the Papacy..	381	Behring Sea Controversy.....	354
Tariffs, The.....	241, 377	Blaine's, Mr., Pan-American Congress	291
		—— Letter.....	310

	PAGE		PAGE
Brazilian Revolution, The...	123	War of Races in the South.	147
Business in Congress.....	351	Washington's Life, by Cabot Lodge	367
City Government	250	Wealth Accumulation.....	249
College Training.....	366	Woman Suffrage in Wyoming	251
Conduct of the Americans...	24		
Cronin Verdict, The.....	123	ENGLISH AFFAIRS :	
Davis, Death of Jefferson....	119	Bye-Elections in England.	58
Degradation of Politics, The.	264	Catastrophe of Mr. Caine.	359
Divorce Question, The....	153	Cession of Heligoland, The..	324
Enfranchisement of Women.	116	Choosing a Leader.....	127
Fall of the Monarchy in Brazil.....	90	Churchill, Lord, the End of..	231
Federal Election Bill.....	352	Coleridge, Lord, and Journal- ism	392
George's, Mr. Henry, Theory	158	English Politics. 21, 124, 252, 293, 356	
Household Service.....	168	Fox and Derby.....	326
International Copyright.....	299	Gladstone and Pitt.....	23
Labour Disturbances.....	248	Imperial Federation. 58, 128, 294	
McKinley Tariff, The.....	309	Industrial War in England... 198	
Millionaires.....	237	Ireland and the Land Ques- tion.....	94, 151
Morse's Life of Franklin....	373	Ireland, Famine in.....	392
Nationalization of Land.. 94,	236	Labouchere and Salisbury... 230	
"Our Infant Woollens"....	314	Labour Disturbances.....	129
President's Message and Reci- procity, The.....	118	London Docks Strikes.....	59
Prospects of Deadlock in the United States.....	293	Manning, Cardinal, and The Strikes	153
Protectionism..... 33,	155	Mutinies in England.....	390
Reciprocity.....	31	Opening of the British Par- liament.....	195
Silver Bill, The.... 292, 312,	353	Parnell's, Mr., Change of Front.....	358
Tariff, The.....	209	Commission, Re- port of.....	192
Three Americas, The.....	55		
Two Markets, The.....	33		

	PAGE		PAGE
Passion for Scandal, The..99,	131	THOUGHT AND OPINION :	
Perils of England	27	Admission to Universities	206
Political Situation in Eng-		Agnosticism and its Practical	
land	91, 323	Bearings	259
Rosebery, Lord, on Imperial		Anglicanism and Rome.....	203
Federation	128	Anglo-Israel	134
St. Pancras Election, The... 229		Atheism and Public Morality	328
Salisbury, Lord, on Imperial			
Federation	58	Browning, The Poet, and His	
Scandals in England, The.99,	131	Obscurity.....	261
Situation in England, The.91,	323		
<i>Times</i> , The, and its Enemies. 194		Corson, Prof., on Shakespeare	404
Wolseley, Lord, Against War	360	Cremation	238
		Criminal Class, The.....	396
EUROPEAN AND EASTERN AFFAIRS :			
Australian Federation	295	Dante's Theology.....	330
Bismarck, The Fall of.....	232	Dollinger, Dr., The Death of.	205
Crisis in France, The	236	Jesuit Morality.....	239
Europe, The State of	148	"Lux Mundi"	256
—— Monarchy in.....	149	Memoir of a Journalist.....	266
European Affairs	362	Methodism and Priestcraft..	332
—— War Cloud, The... 128		Movements in the Churches .	102
First of May, The.....	296	Newman, Cardinal, Death of	400
France, The Crisis in	236		
French Elections, The.....	61	Papacy, The.....	204
—— Revolution, an Ameri-		Persecution, History of.....	100
can on the.....	61	Presbyterian Revision.....	331
German Emperor, The.....	297		
—— Socialism and the		Reform in the Family.....	365
Claims of Labour. 233		Relations of Church and State	363
Monarchy in Europe, The.149,	199	Religious Movements.....	201
Russian Atrocities, The..235,	298	Renan's Manifesto63,	165
What France Wants.....	298	Ruskin, John.....	402
		Shakespeare, Prof. Corson on	404
		Social Absenteeism	97
		Socialism, Spread of.....	394
		Talleyrand's Memoirs.....	328
		Weismann on Life and Death	166

	PAGE		PAGE
CANADIAN LITERATURE AND ART :		Lorne, Lord, as a Novelist ..	169
Art in Canada.....	270, 300, 335	Machar's "Stories of New France"	268
Blackstock's, Mrs., "Land of the Viking".....	72	Masson's North-West Fur Traders	171
Copyright Legislation.....	68	Ontario Mining Report.....	282
Dawson's Handbook of Geol- ogy.....	104	Poole's "Anglo-Israel".....	134
Dixon's "Border Clans".....	104	Pope's "Jacques Cartier" ...	269
Education Report for Ontario	267	Read's "Lives of the Judges" ..	136
Grosswell's Canada	335	— "Life of Governor Simcoe"	375
Kingsford's History of Can- ada.....	170	Royal Society of Canada, Meeting of.....	290
"Layman's Handbook, A" ..	376	University Quarterly Review	254
Literary Journalism in Can- ada.....	407	—	
		Bystander, A Protest by....	272
		— Explanation by ..	302

THE BYSTANDER.

OCTOBER, 1889.

THE situation in the Press is just now singular. Our great Toronto dailies are struggling desperately with each other for existence on an area which is insufficient to support them on the scale of expenditure required in the present day for news, especially for telegraphic news. In these circumstances, there is little chance of a hearing for any cause which does not bring circulation and advertisements, still less for any cause which repels them. Till this conflict is over and the great organs of opinion are set free, the community may have some use even for a very small journal which has nothing, either in the way of commercial exigency or party connection, to restrain it from holding its own course, or bringing any question before the public.

—By the events of the last half year, three questions of the highest importance seem to have been presented in the clearest, most practical, and most urgent manner to our people. The first is, whether the political veto on Provincial legislation is a real power of control, or a nullity. The second is, whether religious equality is, or is not, a fundamental principle of our Commonwealth. The third is, whether there is any hope left of fusing British and French Canada into a united nation.

By a strange freak of destiny, Wolfe's victory seems not only to have been annulled, but to have brought about the

signal triumph of the vanquished. Left to itself, the feeble colony of the Bourbons would have been lopped by the Revolution from the parent tree, and in all probability would have perished. Conquered by England, it has been fostered into a French nation, which now has not only won back Quebec, but threatens to encroach indefinitely on the territory of the British race. The responsibility for this result rests partly on the weakness of the British Government, of which the last manifestation is the attitude of the present Governor-General; partly on Samuel Adams and the other Boston Revolutionists who, in their eagerness to declare Independence, seeing that Quebec had been wrested from France, would not wait till it had been made British; partly on our own factions which, bidding against each other for French and Catholic support, have played into the hands of our antagonists and consummated the process the other day by voting in unison for the Jesuits' Estates Act, and afterwards together relieving their uneasy consciences by singing "God Save the Queen."

The Jesuits' Estates Act was a blow, and a bold one, struck against the Conquest Settlement, and at the same time in favour of the sovereignty of the Pope, for the recognition of which the Nationalist leader is appropriately rewarded with a Papal order of merit. After their victory at Ottawa over British supremacy and Protestant right, the French held a triumphal festival on the day of their national saint, St. Jean Baptiste, and unveiled a monument in honour of the heroes of their French and Papal nationality, Jacques Cartier and the Jesuit Brébeuf. On that occasion, it was exultingly proclaimed that French Canadians would never cease to be French and Catholic; that, as the double monument bore witness, after a century of separation from their mother country, French as well as Catholic they were, French as well as Catholic they would remain. The Red and Blue of French Canadian parties were thenceforth, it was announced, to be merged in the tricolor. Pontifical Zouaves carried in religious procession a flag which had been borne in

battle against the British. The homage of the French Canadian nation was cabled to the Pope, and the Pope recognized the French Canadian nation by responding to the salute. Jesuit and Ultramontane journals joined the choir with editorials frankly avowing that the French nation stood apart from the British, that it had separate aims and a different ideal; in effect, that partnership between it and the British element there was none. Disheartening events these surely for Imperial Federationists! Disheartening events these surely for all who have cherished the hope that a mass of British Protestantism and a mass of French Catholicism, or rather of French Ultramontanism, can be fused into a Canadian nation. Lord Lorne was anxious, among other gifts, to provide us with a national hymn. Is the hymn to be in a dual language with opposite aspirations in alternate stanzas? In September, 1887, to do honour to the French frigate *Minerve*, the French flag was hoisted and the British flag was lowered on the Citadel at Quebec. We were bidden to believe that this was an accident. If it was, it was one of the most pregnant and ominous accidents in history.

We might have been prepared for this turn of events ever since aggressive Ultramontanism ousted quiet Gallicanism from the Church of Quebec; certainly ever since the Jesuit got the helm into his hands. Some years ago Abbé Gingras put forth a pamphlet in which, after glorifying the Dark Ages, justifying the Inquisition, asserting the right of the Church to over-rule the Civil power, and of the Clergy to interfere in elections, he described the necessary policy of French statesmen towards the Dominion as one of conciliation, more or less elastic, with a covert aim,—that is to say, the creation of a French and Papal nationality—in their minds. The history of Canada used in French Canadian schools breathes not French patriotism only, but antagonism to the British. It belittles their victories, exults in those of the French over them, presents them in an odious light, and accuses them of wishing to oppress French Canada as they oppressed Ireland,

ascribing the deliverance to the priests. Of the existence of British Canada it scarcely takes notice. The seed thus sown in the heart of the young French Canadian has sprung up and borne its natural fruit.

We do not blame the French, much less do we desire to say a harsh or disrespectful word of a kindly and courteous race. What they have done an English colony would have done in their place. It was perfectly natural that as they found their numbers and strength increase, they should desire to cast off the ascendancy of the stranger and reverse the conquest. It was perfectly natural that they should take advantage of the weakness of the British Government and of its timorous tendency to court their good-will at the expense of those of whose allegiance it felt more sure. It was perfectly natural that, the political Sovereign being alien, they should accept the native priesthood as their leaders, the Pope as the supreme object of their allegiance, and that their nationality should thus provisionally assume, as it has, a theocratic form. But the fact and the situation have to be faced. Is Quebec to be in the Confederation but not of it, a nation apart, with designs and aspirations of her own, but at the same time ruling us by her compact vote, determining our policy and drawing, as she has drawn, upon our Treasury? Is she to bring up a million or more of our citizens and the electors of our Parliament, not only in the mental condition which priestly rule requires, but in paramount allegiance to the Church of the Jesuit and to a foreign power? Is she to carry on to the end a process of shouldering out the British and Protestant element, and to do what she likes with the remnant in the meantime? Sir Richard Cartwright lays it down that we have no more right to interfere with the action of Quebec than England has to interfere with the action of Canada. Do Canadians take part in electing the British Parliament? Does their delegation coerce the Government, and enforce the payment of tribute at Westminster, by staying out of the House till the last bell for a division has rung? By the help

of what remains of the old Bleu party an equivocal situation may be prolonged; but the time cannot be far off when we shall have to choose between a reassertion of the national control over Provincial legislation and a dissolution of partnership with Quebec.

Lord Durham feared that the day might come when the English of Lower Canada, to remain English, would have to cease to be British. He strove to avert that day by the Union of the Provinces which he thought would bring the French under the political ascendancy of the British. The measure might possibly have succeeded in the hands of a Royal Governor with full powers: in those of party politicians, bidding against each other for the French and Catholic vote, it was sure to fail. Moreover, changes adverse to Lord Durham's object have taken place. The legendary Frenchman who was to fire the last gun for British dominion belongs to the times when the dominant priesthood regarded with fear and aversion Revolutionary France as well as Puritan New England. New France is now reunited in heart to her mother country. Forces opposed to the ascendancy of the priesthood and to the national unity of which it is at present the organizing force and the bond may be at work; the French emigration into New England, if it becomes American and at the same time retains its connection with those who stay behind, may prove a conduit of disturbing ideas; the exactions of the Church may become intolerable to the peasantry; the educated classes may feel the effects of contact with the literary Liberalism of old France; but at present it appears that the combined national and sacerdotal movement of which Jacques Cartier and Brébeuf are the symbols is in the ascendant, and that its leader has the ball at his foot.

—The law points of the Jesuits' Estates Case must be left to lawyers, and the country is somewhat weary of that part of the discussion. We will not combat again the figment of a

cloud on the public title to the Jesuit property, as if there could be any cloud on the title of property which had passed to the Crown both by treaty and by escheat, and had been duly made over by it to the Province. The Minister of Justice admits that in the Preamble to the Act there were things "which might have been in better taste," in other words, that there was matter offensive to the feelings of the nation. For the excision of that matter, at all events, if the feelings of the nation had been thought entitled to any respect, the Act would have been remanded to the Quebec Legislature. Perhaps, however, wrong is done by this admission to the framers of the Act, who could scarcely have devised a more delicate way of asserting the two things which it was their object to assert, the abrogation of the Conquest Settlement and the supremacy of the Pope. The people have felt that, apart from all narrow technicalities, they have a broad right, if we are a nation, to resist the infusion at the public expense of poison into the national veins. They know what Jesuitism is, what it has done, what are its principles and aims, how the nations of Europe, even those which were most liberal and tolerant, have found themselves compelled to deal with it, and they are resolved that, at least, the State shall not implant and foster it here. They are resolved also that under no pretext will they be brought to recognize the supremacy of the Roman Catholic Church over the State or the ascendancy of a foreign power. They understand the majority at Ottawa, and see in it only a reason for trying to rescue the country from the domination of the Catholic vote.

The Governor-General says that there is no evidence before him to show that the Jesuits in the Dominion and in this nineteenth century are less loyal and law-abiding citizens than others. He has before him the Encyclical, which the Jesuit brings in his hand and which asserts the supremacy of the Church over the State and the right of the Church to use force for the imposition of her creed, thus directly contravening the organic principles of a Commonwealth founded on State supre-

macy and freedom of conscience. He has before him the claims of the clergy under Jesuit influence to interfere, against the law, in elections. He has before him the institutes of the Order, by which the Jesuit surrenders his judgment and his conscience into the hands of Superiors resident at Rome, whose commands supersede his duty to his country. He has before him the clauses of the Catholic Emancipation Act passed by his own Legislature, when "this nineteenth century" was twenty-nine years old, and the repeal of which no one would venture to propose, treating the Jesuits as dangerous to the State. He has before him the doings of the Jesuit since the beginning of the nineteenth century in Spain, Italy, Switzerland, France and Germany, and the action which the Governments of those countries have found themselves compelled to take in order to deliver themselves from his machinations. He must know well that what the Order of Loyola was in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries it is now; that its laws, its aims, and its means are unchanged; that it is the same in all dominions and countries as well as in all centuries; that its members are citizens of nothing but a world-wide conspiracy against liberty, light and human progress; and that if they accept the citizenship of a Protestant Commonwealth it is for the purpose of its subversion. Guy Fawkes had to be law-abiding till the time came for firing the train, and the Jesuit no doubt was law-abiding in Switzerland till the time came for kindling the flames of civil war. The very property which is given to the Jesuit he cannot hold. It is held, as Solicitor-General Wedderburn states in that opinion with which we should like to see the Minister of Justice deal, by an authority at Rome and may be used, and is very likely to be used, for the purposes of intrigue against the British power in China, Madagascar, or any part of the globe.

On the point of Constitutional Law the nation was surely entitled to the judgment after full and fair hearing of its own Supreme Court. Of this it had been deprived by devices of the kind which we are learning to regard as statesmanship,

and in giving effect to which the chair of the House of Commons was made to play a very sinister part. The case, it was pretended, could not be submitted to a legal tribunal when it had been before Parliament, as though it were the province of Parliament to decide a question of law. At last, instead of the judgment of our own Supreme Court, there is palmed upon us the opinion of the British Law Officers, who have no judicial authority in the matter, and who are politicians and members of the same party with Sir John Macdonald. An opinion is worthless without the case on which it is given; yet the case is withheld; and we are not even told by whom the opinion was sought. Is this the proper way to treat the nation? To speak of such an opinion as satisfactory or conclusive on any point is mockery; but after all the only point which it touches is the bare legal power of the Legislature of Quebec. It can in no way affect the main question, which is whether the political veto ought not to have been applied. The question raised by Mr. Macdougall as to the application of the consolidated fund to a religious purpose, is also apparently left untouched.

—One bright side, at all events, this controversy has. It has evoked a greater breadth of public sentiment on a question of principle, and outside the party lines, than anything since the Pacific Railway Scandal. For a time the Machines have been thrown out of gear, much to the dismay of the Machinists, and the moral interval would be a gain even if the agitation to which we owe it were far less reasonable and righteous than it is. The politicians flatter themselves that the storm will presently blow over, that this abnormal and scandalous outbreak of public morality will subside, and that we shall get comfortably back to the regular game of Political Euchre, of which the Right Bower is the Catholic vote. Their hope may be fulfilled. Party organizations are wonderfully strong, strong as usual in inverse proportion to their reason-

ableness, and the Shibboleths have extraordinary power. Otherwise, how should an inhabitant of Port Arthur be found giving a party vote for a tariff which keeps his minerals locked up in the bowels of the earth, and prevents his village from becoming a mining city? Yet it may be doubted whether things will again be exactly as they have been. They certainly will not if the Equal Rights Association continues in existence and maintains anything like its present strength. We do not despair of seeing some of the Machine veterans replaced at the next election by fresh men, such as a struggle of principle brings to the front. A better start than this great question affords, a political aspirant can scarcely desire.

An episode in the movement of special interest is the conflict in the Orange body, between the nobler element and that which is less noble. The Orange banner has so long been trailed behind the Catholic vote, in the service of political party, and by leaders whose aims are much more practical than those of the Deliverer, that instantaneous regeneration is not to be expected. But it is evident that at least the liegemen of place and patronage have no small difficulty in keeping the upper hand. If Orangeism cannot get its head out of the lap of Delilah and again do its first work, it ought, if it has any respect for the shades of the illustrious dead, to cease to take in vain the name of a hero. It is impossible that there could be two human beings with characters and aims more entirely opposed to each other than the Grand Master of a place-hunting organization and William of Orange.

The political veto of the Central Government on Provincial Legislation was justly designated by Sir Alexander Galt in his pamphlet on "Church and State," as the one sure guarantee for Protestant and civil rights and liberties in Quebec, without which the representative guarantee would some day "dissolve into thin air." The abandonment of that veto, and with reference to one of the very class of cases to which it was specially intended to be applied, by the Central Government, is plain notice to the Protestants of Quebec

that they are to be left without protection, and has apparently broken their slumber at last. Their apathy, which allowed the incorporation of the Jesuits to pass without protest, has hitherto been the weak point in the case. They have perhaps had the excuse of hopelessness, and also that of heavy pressure, since prominent opposition to the Church is visited on her part with penalties, to which philosophers who arraign Equal Rights men for intolerance would do well to turn their attention. A British farmer in the Eastern Townships may not unnaturally deem it better to decamp than to live in perpetual conflict with adverse influences, municipal and fiscal as well as social. The chiefs of commerce in Montreal, who would be the natural leaders of the British and Protestants, probably wish to make their fortunes undisturbed; their fortunes made, nothing ties them to Quebec. Montreal may find, however, indeed she has already begun to find, as would Belfast if Home Rule were conceded, that with a Catholic Legislature not only Protestant liberties but the Protestant strong-box is in peril.

—Fanaticism is the epithet brandished against the opponents of Jesuit incorporation and endowment by politicians who can themselves hardly debate the most trivial question of party politics without displaying fanaticism of the narrowest and most virulent kind. Some have even talked of persecution, though there has not been a whisper of desire to impose upon Roman Catholics or Jesuits a penalty or disability of any sort, or to prevent them from propagating their opinions, or, for that matter, their casuistry with the same freedom as is allowed to any other Church or sect. The battle is for civil right and for equality, and for these alone. The Church of Rome is not merely a body of spiritual opinion, organized opposition to which might be apt to contract the character of persecution or fanaticism; it is, and avows itself in the Encyclical to be, a temporal power using the sword, whenever it can

get the sword into its hand, to maintain and extend a sway which has brought it enormous wealth and power, and when it cannot get the sword into its hand, using for the same purpose intrigue and the votes of masses under its ecclesiastical command. Jesuitism is not merely a body of extreme spiritual opinion: it is a great social and political conspiracy, though in aid of ecclesiastical aggrandizement, which by its machinations has filled Christendom with blood and havoc, and has made for itself a record of evil more terrible than that of any worldly power of iniquity. It may be doubted whether Garibaldi, Mazzini, and the other European patriots in their mortal struggle with Jesuitism and the powers under its influence, ever thought of the theological peculiarities of the Jesuit, or even of his casuistical tamperings with morality. They saw in him only the arch-enemy of freedom, and the murderer of its friends. "A company of teachers and preachers," the Minister of Justice calls the Society of Loyola. He might almost as well apply the term to the troopers of the Catholic League, or the crews of the Armada. Were all the Liberal statesmen of Europe who combated and expelled Jesuitism, fanatics and slaves of religious hatred?

Nor does the movement involve hatred of race any more than it involves hatred of religion. We, as a race, are trustees of a civilization of which the organic principle is liberty, political and religious. That civilization is being attacked by another race under the influence, unhappy, as we think, of the immemorial and inveterate enemies of the principle, which at the same time threatens to extend its borders at the expense of ours. We must defend our trust, and this may be done without any feeling against the race, and with a very lively conviction that the greatest boon which we could bestow on our French fellow-subjects would be deliverance from the dominion of obscurantism and the reactionary influence of the Medieval Church.

That the agitation is not, as the political managers of one party say, a plot against Sir John Macdonald, or as those of

the other party say, a plot against Mr. Mowat, is disproved, if such absurdity needs disproof, by the fact that ecclesiastical aggression of the same kind is provoking a similar reaction on the other side of the Line. Mr. John Jay, the eminent publicist, and Bishop Coxe, of Western New York, are there saying precisely what the leaders of the Equal Rights movement are saying here. With legions recruited by masses of ignorance and superstition from her European domain, and armed with the American franchise, Rome is moving against American civilization. The Catholic *Telegraph* of Cincinnati says: "We hold the balance of power in the national elections, and, if united, control many State and municipal elections also." The first point of attack there as here is the school, and the attack is met there as here by what may be called an Equal Rights agitation for the abolition of all public grants for sectarian purposes, whether veiled under the name of "teaching and preaching," or under that of charity.

The issue of the conflict between Rome and modern society, which the Encyclical so boldly challenges, cannot, from our point of view, be regarded as doubtful. Nothing seems more certain than that the Papacy is dead at the root, though after so many centuries of ascendancy and when it has so completely entwined itself with all the fibres not only of religious but of political, moral and even æsthetic life in European Christendom, the process of dissolution must be slow. A spasmodic energy has been lent to it of late by the violent determination of power to its ecclesiastical head, which has produced the ascendancy of Ultramontaniam and the Jesuit, but is merely the proof of its loss of influence over the national governments. Its faith lingers only like the snow-wreaths of spring in the dark hollows of the hills, such as Calabria, Tyrol, Ireland, and Quebec. Its only propagator, saving the Jesuit, is the Irish dispersion which itself in the second, or, at latest, the third generation, falls away. Nevertheless, its forces on this continent are formidable; its organization is immensely strong; it is favoured to a fatal extent by the

emulous servility of the factions, and before it succumbs it may give our civilization a very bad quarter of an hour.

—Not nationality only, but extension of their nationality, is the aim of the French, some of whom see glorious visions of a French and Papal Empire in North America. On Eastern Ontario they are encroaching apace, introducing their language into the public schools, and with it their ecclesiastical system. Party has opened the door for them and will probably continue to hold it open, while our commercial system by expatriating the British farmer makes room for the Frenchman, whose standard of living is much lower. The French begin to demand representation in the Ontario Cabinet, and their claim apparently will soon be backed by numbers which the politicians will be unable to resist. It is difficult to foresee the end of this process.

The scene of the conflict now shifts to the North-West. Thither also, as we have good reason to know, the aspirations of the French Nationalist extend. Riel's first rebellion, unlike his second, was practically a success. With the aid of Sir George Cartier it gave the French the recognition of their nationality, the dual language, and Separate Schools. Upon this basis and operating from St. Boniface as their stronghold, they have been trying to wrest from the British the future of the North-West. The energies of one able and active priest are devoted to the promotion of French immigration, which is organized with the aid of Church funds. But in Manitoba the stars in their courses fight against the enterprise as manifestly as they fight for it in Quebec. The number of the French Catholics is small, and they are being swamped by the inflow of the English-speaking race, whose tongue the other fractions of nationalities, such as the Mennonites and Icelanders, gradually adopt. It happens moreover that for the present the chief instrument of their aggrandizement has fallen from their hands. The British have been united by the struggle for railway

emancipation against the Ottawa government and the C. P. R. Sir John Macdonald, by the course which he has taken, has annihilated his party, and the Opposition in the Local Legislature is literally reduced to a corporal's guard. The French have thus ceased to hold the balance of power, there being no balance of power to hold, and can no longer play the game of hovering between the parties and compelling both to obey their will. To complete their misfortunes, it appears that at the critical moment they have encountered a strong man. Against the dual language a blow has already been struck, and war has been declared against the Separate Schools. But to abolish the Separate Schools the Manitoban Act must be amended: the only other course at least is the awkward one of stopping the grant to the schools; and the question is thus likely to come before the Dominion Parliament, and to test the zeal of the Liberals for local liberties and their power of adhering to principle in defiance of the Catholic vote. Will those who have voted that the Roman Catholic and Jesuit Legislature of Quebec shall be allowed to tax Protestants in aid of a conspiracy for the subversion of their own religion, turn round and vote that the people of Manitoba shall not be allowed to adopt Equal Right as the principle of their system of public instruction?

For Separate Schools there was perhaps a plea when Roman Catholic disabilities, having been but recently removed, and the religion being still in some measure under social proscription, there might be reason to apprehend want of respect for the faith of a Catholic pupil. There can be no plea now when all such danger is past, and thousands of Roman Catholic children are being brought up in public schools without any complaint on the part of their parents. It is not from the parents indeed that these complaints come; it is from the priests. The priest desires that the child shall be brought up as a liegeman of the Church. The State contends that he shall be brought up as a citizen of the Commonwealth, though without prejudice to his faith or his Church-membership; and upon this issue is joined, alike in the United States

and here, indeed wherever Rome is struggling to create her empire within the empire and above the empire of the State. Since the removal of any special danger to the faith or self-respect of Catholics, there can be no tenable plea for the concession of privilege to any particular Church. If Roman Catholics are entitled to Separate Schools, Episcopalians, Presbyterians and Methodists are entitled to them also. The only assignable ground for the special claim is that Roman Catholics alone have a religious conscience to be respected, and the rest are mere heretics. This, a free-spoken ecclesiastic, like the Bishop of Kingston, sometimes gives us pretty plainly to understand. But it is a plea which the State cannot for a moment entertain.

What the real tendencies of the Church of Rome are, with regard to popular education, we learn from its condition in the countries where she has had things entirely her own way, such as Spain, Calabria, Sicily, Brittany, the Roman Catholic Provinces of Austria, and the Spanish Colonies in South America before their emancipation. The Jesuit himself, though a professed educator, did little or nothing for the education of the people. He confined himself almost entirely to the children of the rich and powerful, or to those destined for the priesthood; and in dealing with these his real object was not to enlighten, but to cure, by intellectual vaccination, the pestilential desire for light. It is only where she is threatened by Protestant rivalry that the Church of Rome becomes so anxious about schools. A Canadian politician who subsists upon French votes, writing to the *London Times* the other day, did not want the effrontery to assert that more liberal provision was made for popular education in French than in British Canada. Massachusetts, it appears, reports that among the French immigrants, who are pretty sure not to be the least active-minded and intelligent of their race, there are 13,319 illiterates to 8,913 who can read and write. Arthur Buies, in *La Lanterne*, cites a correspondent who has held high office and has lived in a rural district in the French Pro-

vince for forty years. This correspondent deposes that among men between twenty and thirty you will not find one in twenty who can read, or one in fifty who can write. "They will tell you," he says, "that they went to school from seven to fourteen, but that they have forgotten all they learned. This all, what was it? We may judge from the fact that the teachers are for the most part young girls taken from the convents, because they are too poor to pay their pupil's fee, and with a salary of from ten to twenty louis a year." This description is confirmed by the testimony of all who have lived among the *habitans*. Even the mayor of a town, trustworthy informants tell us, is not always able to write. But perhaps as signal a proof of the general ignorance as any is the performance of miracles, which goes on with unabated success and with immense profit, material as well as moral, to the Church at Ste. Anne de Beaupré. Why are no miracles performed in Ontario and New England? It was rash in a Protestant divine to undertake to prove in theological tournament that the Church of Rome teaches that the end justifies the means. Even Iago does not chalk his principles on the walls of Cyprus. But as some at least of the higher ecclesiastics are educated men and exempt from vulgar illusions, it would not be difficult to show that in countenancing the miracles of Ste. Anne de Beaupré, Knock, and Lourdes, as well as the miraculous liquefaction of the blood of St. Januarius, and the exhibition of the House of Loretto, or the stairs of Pilate, to multitudes of dupes who pour money into the coffers of the Church, they must at least be acting on the principle that means the most equivocal are justified by an end which to them seems to be good. It would be presumptuous in us to undertake to save the French of Quebec against their will; but from our point of view, at all events, we must repeat we are not displaying hatred of them by relaxing the grasp of a Church which not only devours their substance and grows inordinately rich, while they are very poor, but keeps them in the darkness which priestly rule and thaumaturgy everywhere require.

—When Separate Schools are abolished we shall have to face the difficult question whether the Bible is to be used in schools. So far as the mass of the community is concerned, morality is still based upon religion, and to read the Bible, or at least the New Testament provided that no sectarian dogma is introduced, is merely to teach children the received ethics. Where the people are unanimous in desiring that the Bible should be read, there can surely be no reasonable objection to the practice. But when anybody objects, it would seem that our principle requires us to respect the objection. It may come and is likely to come, as we have said, from the priest rather than from the parent. A parent is not very likely of himself to object to the reading of a plain ethical portion of the Gospel or a simple parable, because the Douay Version is not used. But it avails little to scrutinize the motive of the objector if he is only exercising his right. We must fall back for religious instruction on the Sunday School. Let our system be founded in righteousness, though it be in some measure to our own hindrance.

Is it just to compel those who choose on religious grounds to pay for Separate Schools for their children, also to pay school tax for the Public Schools? The case of these people is not harder than that of the rich who do not use the Public Schools, or that of the childless who have no use for schools at all. It is not harder than that of the man with one child, who is made to pay for the schooling of the children of his neighbour with six. The whole system is based on the political necessities of a democracy which, without it, would be governed by total ignorance. We do not ourselves profess to rejoice above measure in an arrangement which legally supersedes the duties and responsibilities of the parent in regard to education by the action of the state. Nor do we fail to mark the difference between the original common school of New England which, the community being so small and its members so well acquainted with each other, must have been essentially parental, though on a joint-stock plan, and

the present State machine. But the political necessity is paramount, and as all equally share the political benefit, it is consistent, at any rate with rough justice, that all should equally pay. The political benefit, however, ought to be secured, and it can be secured only by an educational qualification for the franchise. This might be enforced either by the presentation of a certificate of attendance at an authorized school—and private schools might be authorized for this purpose—or by requiring the applicant to prove to the Register his ability to read and write. Every man has by nature a right to justice and fair treatment at the hands of the community and its government. But the notion that every man has by nature a right to political power, whether there is any chance or none of his using it for the benefit of the community and himself, whether he knows anything or knows nothing about the questions on which he is to vote, must be relegated to that limbo near the moon to which reason has now sent the Jeffersonian generalities of the preamble to the Declaration of Independence. Mechanics are generally supposed to be the revolutionary class; yet we never happened to fall in with an intelligent mechanic who refused to admit that political power is a trust, and that to be allowed to exercise it a man ought to be capable at least of informing himself about the questions which are to be decided by his vote.

—Speculation as to the prospects of Canadian parties is little in THE BYSTANDER's line. We are of the number of those who look forward to the day when the reign of party will cease, when governments instead of being partisan will be national, and when this perpetual civil war of intrigue, calumny and corruption, which some people take for an ordinance of Heaven, will acquit Heaven by coming to an end. The party system is almost everywhere in a state of pronounced disintegration; parties are almost everywhere split-

ting into sections, none of which are capable of supporting a government. In the British House of Commons there are now at least five sections, and government is carried on only by a precarious coalition of two of them. In France, amidst the chaotic strife, no administration can live, and the people in despair turned their eyes to a circus-rider who promised to redeem them from anarchy. Such at least we take to be the solution of the Boulanger enigma. If the Canadian Government seems to be an exception, and to be comparatively stable, its stability has been secured by means which have entailed, to a deplorable extent, the political corruption of a people naturally as well fitted for free institutions and as worthy of them as any people in the world. It is vain to attempt prediction till there has been time to measure the staying power of the Equal Rights movement, and to see how it will affect the party organizations. Each of the two is threatened with a revolt, the Conservatives with that of the Orangemen, the Liberal with that of Liberals who are determined to keep the Liberal faith undefiled, and not to be dragged into alliance with priestly domination and reaction. The Liberal leaders are probably by this time aware that by supporting the Jesuit Act in the manner they did, they played into the hands of their enemy. Supposing that they felt themselves bound by the extreme theory of Provincial Right, into which they had been drawn by their antagonism to the party in possession of the central power, and hampered by the fatal connection with Rielism, into which shallow intrigue had seduced them, they ought surely in giving an equivocal vote to have taken care to found it on the special reason and to keep their general principles free from stain. They ought surely to have made it clear that they had no fellowship with Jesuitism or ecclesiastical aggression, that they were true to religious equality, and that they regarded with respect and sympathy feelings and fears identical with those which had been displayed, in a more extreme form, by all the Liberal statesmen of Europe. It was their duty also, we venture to

think, even in their character of professed Home Rulers, to insist firmly on the right of the nation to have a question of constitutional law tried by its own Supreme Court. Instead of this, they flung themselves into the arms of the Government, lauded the speech of the Minister of Justice, which was nothing but a sophistical representation of the whole transaction, its history and the motives of those engaged in it; and allowed a body of their friends, considerable both in numbers and in weight of character, to feel that they were treated as fools and fanatics. One of them afterwards went further and displayed his superior philosophy in a highly offensive speech. Preternaturally shrewd as they are within a certain range, politicians often strangely fail to take the measure of public feeling. To Reciprocity, we presume, the Liberals mean to adhere. Their leader embraced it late and with apparent hesitation, but he embraced it, and has since been faithful to it. If this is not their platform they have no platform at all, and the next general election will once more see them fall before a Machine management superior to their own, and provided with a great fund of corruption to which they have no clear and popular policy to oppose. Disaster will teach them that they can have no moral or sound alliance with anything in Quebec, except the party, whether Protestant or Rouge, which aims at bringing the Church under control, repressing her political aggression, putting an end to her reactionary influence on popular education, arresting her absorption of wealth, and setting the people free from her imposts.

Any day may of course see the scene changed by the retirement of the aged leader of the Tory party, and the dissolution of a fabric built not on principle, but on a personality, which, as everybody says, must ensue. Sir Charles Tupper has judiciously retired to a distance from any cabals which may be going on about the succession. If a vacancy occurred he would be called, and there can be little doubt that he would listen to the voice of duty. He will find it difficult, however, to gather the wires into his hands. He may even

find, if these agitations go on, that the revival of public morality has seriously impaired the Machine.

—From the other side of the water the great news is that our Mother Country has apparently escaped dismemberment. Disunion is at a discount; Radicals keep it in the background at the elections; and the fountain of its money supplies is ceasing to flow. Everyone who had studied Ireland knew that the political question was little, and the agrarian question almost all, so that if the agrarian agitation could be allayed the political agitation would subside. The Irish peasant would care no more for a Parliament than for a metaphysical treatise or a theodolite if he had not been told that it would give him the land. O'Connell's Repeal movement ended in nothing but the payment of Repeal rent to O'Connell, that of Smith O'Brien ended in the cabbage garden. It will have been remarked that the political agitators while they preached agrarian plunder have been by no means anxious to promote land law reform. For the present the Union is safe, and we may rejoice, apart from any narrow or selfish pride of Empire, as Englishmen, in the preservation of the centre and the heart of our race; as men, in the preservation of what all the best minds of Europe acknowledge to be a great power of good. There is not a true Liberal in Europe who does not think that humanity would suffer by the victory of savagery and superstition over British civilization, who wishes to see Ireland made over to a Papal Parliament, or imagines that the cause of Pontifical Zouaves is the cause of freedom. The escape was narrow. Even a few days before the division on that motion of Mr. Gladstone, by which, it is idle to doubt, had it been carried, Ireland would have been severed from her sister island, the Unionist leaders expected to be beaten by sixteen. Yet Mr. Bright spoke the truth when he said that there were not more than twenty men in the House outside the Irish party who were sincerely in favour of the motion. All the

rest voted for the dismemberment of their country under the pressure of the party screw applied by Mr. Gladstone, through Mr. Schnadhorst. Such are the dangers with which, even in such a country as England, where most of the public men are too rich to care for patronage or pelf, party threatens not only the good government but the very life of the nation. For, we repeat, no man of sense can doubt that a separate Parliament given to Ireland in the present mood of the people would mean complete separation, and not only complete separation, but the conversion of Ireland into a hostile power, intriguing with all the enemies of Great Britain, and threatening her with war from Irish ports.

Mr. Gladstone has lost control over the Radicals, who have set up an organization and a whip of their own. As he recedes from the scene let it be said that the charge against him is not that of inconsistency, to which it is generally a good answer to say that a man who never changes his mind can have no mind to change. That with which he is charged and will forever stand charged in history is having turned round on a vital question, and brought his country into the extremity of peril for the sake of the Parliamentary majority which was necessary to carry him back to power. For nearly fifty years he had been in public life; during a great part of that time he had been in office; he had been constantly called upon to study, often to deal with, the Irish question. Does anybody believe that all this light about the iniquity of the Union, the infamy of the means by which it was obtained, the villany of Mr. Pitt, whom he had before lauded for that very act, the blessings to Ireland of an independence, which he had before declared would be the renewal of internecine war between religious factions, and the iniquity of coercion, which he had been carrying on in its most stringent form, dawned upon his mind at the moment when he found, after the general election, that he would not have a majority without the Parnellite vote? Does anybody believe that at that precise moment boycotting ceased in his eyes to "have murder for its sanction,"

"the steps of the League" to be "dogged by crime," and Mr. Parnell to be "wading through rapine to dismemberment?" In his despair at the loss of power, and his rage against his country for rejecting him, he plunged into a course of what, in a man instructed as he is and trusted by the State as he has been, can only be designated as political crime. He stirred up Provincial hatred and hostility to the Union not in Ireland only but in Scotland and Wales. He laboured with malignant energy to set the masses against the classes, pointed out the learned and scientific professions to popular hatred, and put forth a false version of political history to show that intelligence had always been the enemy of justice. He has traduced the country before the whole world, exposed her to the hatred and scorn of foreign nations, and defiled with rabid calumnies the memories of her foremost statesmen. He has stimulated sedition, countenanced resistance to the law, and held the Government up to execration for repressing outrage by measures far less severe than he was himself but yesterday employing for the same purpose. All this he has done on the pretext that the Government would not pass a measure of Home Rule, while he steadfastly refused, avowedly on strategic grounds, to say what was the measure which he wanted Government to pass. Having been the devout champion of Church Establishment, not on ordinary grounds of policy, but on the high ground of divine obligation, he now holds out Disestablishment as a bribe to the dissenters for supporting his Irish Policy. What was the coarse corruption of Rigby and Sandwich to this? There is hardly such a moral fall in history. The only excuse is the blind self-worship bred by constant adulation, and that excuse Mr. Gladstone must share with characters in history to associate him with whom in his better and happier hour would have been profane.

Mr. Gladstone's last charges against Pitt, it seems, are that of provoking rebellion in Ireland to pave the way for Union, and that of holding out to the Irish Catholics Emancipation as a lure, while he well knew that George III. would refuse to

grant it. Both charges are baseless. Pitt had faults, but he was thoroughly honourable, and incapable of even contemplating for a moment the tortuous and infamous courses which seem to suggest themselves to the mind of Mr. Gladstone. He would have been mad if, in 1798, he had wilfully added to all the perils by which he was encompassed, that of an Irish rebellion, accompanied, as it was sure to be, by a French invasion. What Irish factions may have done to each other is a different question. Pitt neither belonged to nor sympathized with any Irish faction. For the second charge, there is not a particle of evidence, nor has it the shadow of probability. George III., though very narrow-minded, was not so great a bigot as is assumed. He always expressed his dislike of the uncharitable dogmatism of the Athanasian Creed by refusing to stand up when it was read; he spoke with respect and sympathy of the Methodists, and what is more, there is reason to believe that on the Catholic question he had been touched by the noble reasonings of Burke. But at the fatal moment, the Chancellor and two Archbishops crept to the King's ear and persuaded him that by consenting to Pitt's measure he would break his Coronation oath, thus forfeiting his title and that of his family to the Crown. This neither Pitt nor anyone else, except the plotters, could have foreseen. The mischief was mainly done by the Chancellor's betrayal to the King of a confidential letter written by Pitt. Perhaps Mr. Gladstone would say that Pitt wrote the letter, foreseeing that his confidence would be betrayed. Pitt gave the most decisive evidence of his good faith by laying down power at once and, as it then appeared, forever. If only that commanding figure could rise for a moment opposite to his accuser in the House of Commons, self-righteousness might stand rebuked before patriotism and honour.

—Nothing can have been more ignoble or more disheartening to the friends of popular government than the con-

duct throughout this Irish business of the public men and the Press in the United States. Their hypocrisy is manifest. If they are animated by this burning hatred of coercion, why do they not show it when Russia coerces Poland, when Germany coerces Posen and Alsace-Lorraine, when Italy coerces Sicily, when Austria proclaims a state of siege in some province which is restless under her rule? Why is their philanthropy confined to Ireland, and their righteous indignation concentrated on Great Britain? When the Irish in New York rose against the draft, which they had as good right to resist as they have to resist payment of their debts, Americans massacred them without mercy and without remorse, nor have they been sparing of the halter for Molly Maguires. Congress and the State Legislatures have committed what they must all have known to be flagrant breaches of international right and courtesy, by passing resolutions of sympathy with disaffection in another and a friendly nation; not only the Fisheries Treaty but the Extradition Treaty has been rejected without a pretence of honourable reason; the laws of diplomatic courtesy have been broken by the rude and abrupt dismissal of a British Ambassador; an acting President of the United States has accepted a nomination in terms pledging him to impertinent interference in the affairs of a foreign country; a President elect has signed an address justifying outrage in Ireland; a Senator, and one of the highest moral pretensions, has palliated the Phoenix Park murders; honour has been refused to the memory of John Bright, the foremost champion of the Republic in its darkest hour; even the laws of good manners have been violated by those to whom they were not unknown, while day by day the Press has fed the maw of malignity with envenomed falsehood. All this under the tyrannic lash of the Irish vote. Was it worth while to rebel against George III. if the end was to be such a bondage of the national soul as this? An Eastern slave bows his head, not his conscience, and he is at least sincere in reverence of his Sultan. Mr. Gladstone is always appealing to what he

calls tributes of American sympathy. The tributes extorted by the Irish vote are as Irish as if they were penned at Cork. However, the revolt has begun. The murder of Cronin has lifted the veil which hid the features of the Clan-na-Gael. American citizens moreover of British or Canadian origin have at last seen the duty and the wisdom of being naturalized, and are being naturalized in numbers which will soon begin to counterbalance the Irish. They are not going to form another anti-national, unpatriotic, plotting and plundering clan in American politics; but they will make it an unsafe trade for the political sycophant to trample on the feelings of his British or Canadian fellow-citizens.

But can Canada cast the first stone at American politicians? Did not Canadian Legislatures, Federal and Provincial, pass resolutions of sympathy with the cause of disunion in Great Britain just as unwarrantable as the American resolutions, and under precisely the same influence? Did not the Tory leader begin the game? What was the form of the resolutions signifies little; they were moral aid lent to the deadly enemies of the Mother Country in the attempt to dismember her, and tributes to the Irish vote. They went into the fund of rebellion with the manifestoes and the money of the Clan-na-Gael. A stand was made at last, but it was not made by the holders of titles, or by people who had been at Court, and scanty was the aid or encouragement that it received in high social quarters. Those who, from hope of gaining or fear of losing a vote, helped to strike or refused to aid the Mother Country in her peril, may talk as superciliously as they please of the loyalty of those who did their best for her in that hour of peril. Their censures will be lightly borne.

In one way Canada has aided the Unionists. She has furnished them with a warning example. The Jesuits' Estates Act and the fiscal legislation of Quebec teach England what the uncontrolled rule of a Roman Catholic majority would be in Ireland; the total collapse of the political veto shows what will be the value of a similar veto as a restraint on the Sep-

arartist action of an Irish Parliament; while our whole position is a lesson on the difficulties of that Federal system which Home Rulers so lightly propose as the simplest of all possible solutions. Quebec, though alien, was not so hostile to her British partners in Confederation as Ireland would be; yet to keep her in harmony with the rest of the Dominion and stave off disruption is at least no easy task.

From peril of dismemberment the Mother Country has, for the present at least, escaped. Not only is Home Rule virtually withdrawn, but the Radical party is in disarray and is looking about in vain for a leader, Mr. Bradlaugh, its strongest man, being socially disqualified, and the choice, apart from him, lying between an opportunist who smiles at principle, a literary Jacobin, and a jester. The Government is still strong, notwithstanding some of the losses which are the usual fate of governments at bye-elections. Yet clouds rest upon the future. At the last general election the country was saved by a combined and desperate effort of all who did not wish to see her dismembered, the energy of men and classes usually timid or apathetic being evoked by a great and definite peril. But the next general election will be a time of trial. The fate of the country will be largely in the hands of three masses of voters to whose action no one can look forward without the greatest misgiving—farm labourers, excellent in their calling, but as ignorant as children of all public questions, who vote simply for their bread and cheese, and are open to the wildest illusions as to the direction in which their bread and cheese are to be found; factory hands, many of whom are denationalized, and think much less of the country than of the labour market, while not a few of them are the prey of socialistic chimeras; and Irish peasants who, though little interested in political questions themselves, will probably continue blindly to vote for political leaders hostile to Great Britain. By that time, too, the professional politician, whom the advent of democracy has brought with it, will have had time to work, and the professional always gets the better of the amateur. It

would not be surprising if the Local Government Act, by warming local demagogism and wirepulling into life, should shake the ascendancy of the Conservatives in the metropolis which has hitherto been their stronghold.

—On the cause of Commercial Union, or of freedom of trade with our own continent, whatever people may choose to call it, a shadow has been cast by a notable defection. The reason tendered is the rejection of the scheme by the Americans which is supposed to have been signified at a fish dinner by the mouth of Senator Hoar. Senator Hoar's utterance has since been drowned by the evidence taken before his own Committee at Boston which, in unison with the deliverances of the Chamber of Commerce of New York, and all other commercial bodies which have been approached, shows that commerce in the United States is desirous of the extension of trade relations with this country. The last formal expression of American opinion on the question was a resolution which passed both Houses of Congress, with only one dissentient voice in the Senate, in favour of Commercial Union. What the policy of the new Administration upon the question will be we cannot yet tell: very likely the new Administration itself does not yet know. We can only say that there seems to be nothing in Commercial Union which disagrees, but on the contrary everything which accords, with the interest of the Republican party in its present situation. The Protectionists, who are in the ascendant in that party, must see that in spite of the victory which they so narrowly gained, and gained by such desperate expedients, at the last election, their position is anything but secure; they must understand that the increase of the mechanics' vote in favour of Free Trade shows that the mechanics are beginning to doubt whether Protection means high wages; and they must know that unless the nation has fallen into its dotage they will not be allowed to go on baling out surplus revenue in army pensions at a rate exceeding the cost of the great

standing armies of Europe. Had Mr. Cleveland gone to the country on the general principle which he at first propounded that no government has a right to take from the people more than the public service demands, instead of challenging, as he did by the Mills Bill, the hostility of a number of special interests which were sure to fight him with the fury and the unscrupulousness of despair, it is not unlikely that he might have won. In these circumstances a policy which would at once reduce surplus revenue and extend American trade ought to be welcomed by the Republicans as a signal gift of fortune to their party. But we must wait patiently till Congress meets. The Americans, whom our alarmists suppose to be always coveting our territory and forming sinister designs against us, have in fact slept on the Canadian question for many years. Since the fall of Slavery and the termination of the slaveholder's effort to increase his political power by extension at the South, the Free States have had no motive for seeking a counter-extension at the North; and that the Americans do not desire extension of territory for its own sake, their rejection of St. Domingo, which laid itself at their feet, and their refusal to avail themselves of the opportunities which they have had of annexing Mexico, are sufficient proof. Fully to awaken them takes some time, and is a slower process in the case of the Middle and Southern States than in the case of those on the Northern border. Nor would anybody deny that there are on the side of the Americans, as well as on our side, narrow and selfish interests opposed to the general good, and evil spirits who, either in the interest of monopoly or for the gratification of their personal propensities, are always trying to sow hatred between two sections of the English-speaking race, which, whatever destiny may have in store as to their political relations, must have the closest relations of all other kinds with each other, and depend largely for their common wellbeing on their mutual good-will. It is not the least unhappy part of Protectionism that the monopolist is tempted to cultivate hatred of the nations whose goods he desires to ex-

clude. Political ambition, also, and diplomatic broils may thwart, as they often have thwarted, measures essential to the material welfare of the people. All this, and any other untoward accidents that may occur, must be borne and will be borne patiently and hopefully by those who have no pressing necessity for votes, if they are convinced that admission to our natural market by the removal of the tariff wall would enable us to enjoy the measure of prosperity which nature has intended for us, secure to our industry its just earnings, and bring increase of wealth, comfort and the domestic happiness which attends them into Canadian homes.

As to the state of opinion on this side of the Line it is idle to throw out assertions which cannot at present be brought to a decisive test. All that we can say is that Commercial Unionists believe that in spite of political impediments and false appeals to sentiment, the desire for free admission to the markets of our own Continent is steadily making way among all who are interested in the great natural industries of the country. Those who go among the farmers of Ontario report that the literature which, since politics have unhappily become mixed with the commercial question, has been preferred as a missionary agency to public meetings, is largely read and is doing its work. The North-West, saving Government officials, is a unit upon this question and would be blind indeed if it were not; for the folly of the struggle against Nature is most glaring where nothing but an artificial line separates those whom she has bidden and whom Government forbids to trade. Nothing has prevented the people of Manitoba from moving, but the necessity of giving their undivided attention to the removal of Railway monopoly, from which they are now happily set free. The commercial opposition is almost entirely confined to those manufacturing firms, which believing, rightly or wrongly, that they cannot manufacture as well and as cheaply as the Americans, deem Protection necessary to their existence. The Red Parlour, in short, is the Opposition; and though the Red Parlour is strong in union, in the sinews

of political war, in its control over the Government, to whose election fund it contributes, and in its control over the organs of public opinion which look to it for advertisements, it is not the country, nor can it forever prevent the real interest of the country from being understood. In the Dominion Parliament Reciprocity has been adopted as the platform, and indeed is the sole platform, of a party which, though it represents much less than a moiety of the seats, represents nearly a moiety of the population. Even the Government, bound up as it is with the interest of the Red Parlour, shows signs of misgiving with regard to a commercial policy, which its chiefs manifestly embraced not from economical conviction, but as an expedient of party tactics. The utterances of Sir Charles Tupper at all events must have been somewhat disquieting to Separatists. Apparently the Government feels the pressure of the lumbermen who, unlike the farmers, those patient sheep of all shearers, are an organized interest and able to bring their weight to bear. Regardless of the ignominy of becoming "hewers of wood for the Yankees," it seems anxious to get lumber on the free list, which, however, it will hardly do without some reciprocal concession, such as the free admission of American articles made wholly or principally of wood. Protectionists therefore, who cry that "the fad is dead," need all the comfort which the daily repetition of that cry can give. If personal vituperation and slander of Mr. Erastus Wiman and his associates in the movement, through Protectionist organs, affords any further relief, that satisfaction will not be grudged. The protected manufacturers have reason enough for being angry, though, if they could see things aright, their anger would be turned not against the advocates of a sounder system, but against the political leader who, for purposes of his own, has led them to invest their capital on a basis which is not sound.

It is needless to renew the discussion when there are no fresh arguments. A comparison between the English and the American market can be made, and the allegation on which Separatists constantly take their stand of the superior-

ity in value of the English market can be brought to the test only when the American market is made like the English, free. What at present appears is, that notwithstanding the tariff, our trade with the Americans does not fall in amount far below our trade with the British, while it must be more profitable, as the freights are less; that whenever an opening has been made in the tariff wall by the reduction of duties, trade has rushed through; and that the American market increases in extent much more rapidly than the English. But whatever the advantages of the English market would be, they would not be lost when those of the American were gained. We should have two markets instead of one; in case of war between England and other maritime powers, which may any day break out, we should still have a market instead of having none.

That two neighbouring nations cannot enter into an agreement to trade with each other without detriment to the political independence or the honour of either of them, is an absurdity too preposterous to be nakedly put forward, though it is constantly insinuated under cover of patriotic declamation. It seems to be imagined that Canada is counselled to some act of submission, whereas she is counselled to nothing but the fair consideration of proposals, which, if she finds them inconsistent either with her interest or with her honour, she can at once reject; while if she accepts them, she may reserve to herself, as she did in the case of the old Reciprocity Treaty, full liberty of future withdrawal. After the conclusion of the commercial agreement, as well as before it, the political destinies of Canada would be absolutely in her own hands, and what can any nation which feels its foundations firm and is true to itself desire more? If there is any tendency to political union among us, which the adversaries of Commercial Union strenuously deny, it arises from that action of unifying forces upon two sections of an identical population, geographically interlaced and rapidly fusing, which neither tariff nor vituperation can any more arrest than they can

arrest the course of the sun. Trade does not tend to annexation more than railways, the international extension of which is being actively promoted by men who rave against Commercial Union. The C. P. R. was to be a grand instrument of separation from the United States as well as of union among the Provinces of Canada; it was to be a purely national enterprise, no American was to have any part in it, and its complete severance from the American system was to be secured by monopoly clauses, no matter at what sacrifice of the prosperity of our own North-West. Yet there was an American firm in the Syndicate, capital was sought in New York, an American was the Vice-President, a typical American is now President and Manager. The line is carried through the State of Maine, and is connecting us with the American system at the Sault. Here surely is annexationist conspiracy of the most dangerous kind. Separatism itself, by producing commercial atrophy, has helped to annex to the United States a number of Canadians, equalling the aggregate population of all our Provinces except Ontario and Quebec; and are the men so much less precious than the land? If the removal of obstacles to commerce is good in itself, its results will be good; and among good results all but extravagant jingoes will reckon an increase of friendship between the nations. Easier relations, with regard to the fisheries and other angry questions, could not fail to be produced. It is the policy of Separatism to confuse the commercial discussion by dragging in the political question; the friends of Commercial Union, if they are wise, will decline the lure and leave the future to take care of itself.

Of the interest and honour of England in this matter, England is herself the guardian, since no commercial treaty between us and the United States could be made without her consent. She needs not the officious tutelage of men who, after piling protective duties on her goods, are thrown into paroxysms of outraged loyalty at the thought of discriminating against her when they think that their own interests are

threatened. Even on this side of the water care will be shown for her, should negotiations commence, by people whose loyalty is not less sincere and warm though it may be less vociferous than that of the Protectionists. We cannot act upon two opposite principles at once. If the fiscal unity of the Empire exists, let it be respected; if it has ceased to exist, each member must do the best it can for itself in its own circumstances, which in our case are those of a community forming part of a continent under a protective system. England is already treated by us commercially as a foreign nation, since we lay protective duties on her goods, while she on her part refuses, and will always refuse, to give the colonies any fiscal preference. Nobody proposes to discriminate against her in the invidious sense suggested; all that is proposed is such a tariff arrangement with the United States as will prevent mutual smuggling; so that those who have pointed the iron duty directly against Great Britain have little ground for a display of filial indignation. It has been shown that we already discriminate, though not against particular British articles, against the aggregate of British trade. It has also been shown that in her general interests, which are those of an investor as well as an importer, England would not be a loser but a gainer by the change. Not a cent of revenue would be taken from the British Crown, nor can the interests of a few exporting houses be allowed to outweigh those of the great body of the British and Canadian people.

—A harvest better than was at one time expected in quantity, and first-rate in quality, has revived the confidence of Manitoba and the North-West. The dark hour of despondency which preceded the abolition of railway monopoly, and during which even ex-members of a Conservative Government were departing for the States, while the Province was on the brink of secession, is past, and has been succeeded by a general feeling of hope for the future. Hope there must be, and

almost boundless hope, for the future of such a tract of land so fruitful. Yet, no Manitoban professes to believe that the rate of progress has come up to reasonable expectation. There is the land, but where are the people? There are probably not yet nearly two hundred thousand whites in the whole of that vast region. Dakota and Minnesota, particularly Dakota, with a soil no better and a climate not so good, fill up much more rapidly, and what is still more significant, they fill, Dakota especially, with Canadians. Of this there are probably several causes, apart from the accidents of weather and inexperience of prairie farming. The railway policy of the Government was unpropitious to settlement; whatever may be the value of the Canadian Pacific Railway as a political and military road, its effect on colonization has been bad. It has sent the settlers down a line of a thousand miles, increasing their freights, carrying them away from their centres of distribution, and depriving them of the advantages, social as well as economical, of close settlement, which are particularly needed in such a climate; it is even now carrying settlers on to British Columbia, whence, there being no farm land for them, they pass into Washington Territory or Montana, and are helping rapidly to people Seattle, Tacoma, and Spokane Falls. Then there was railway monopoly, which rode Manitoba like a nightmare, being prolonged by chicane when the Dominion had given a guarantee for thirteen millions as the price of its surrender. Madder freak surely despot never played in the drunkenness of power than the attempt to compel the whole of that region to confine itself to one commercial outlet, and, this fourteen hundred miles away at Montreal. Injudicious and vexatious arrangements with regard to the laying out and allotment of lands, especially the one mile limit, are held to have done no small mischief. The rebellion caused by the neglect of the Ottawa Government to pay timely attention to the claims of the half-breeds and to soothe their simple and not unnatural fears, had also the effect for a time of repelling immigration. But the North-West still groans under a tariff

imposed for the benefit of the Eastern supporters of the Ottawa Government, and to her an unmitigated and undisguised curse. A duty of twenty-five per cent. on farm implements not having proved sufficient to prevent the settler from buying them where they were best and cheapest, another ten per cent. was imposed. This is borne, though people rise in arms and rend an Empire in their indignation at a trifling duty on tea imposed, not in the interest of private gain or political party, but in that of public defence. The tariff and the rebellion, however, are only the two gravest and most conspicuous among the evil consequences of subjection to a distant and party government. Subjection it may be truly called, for the representation of Manitoba and the North-West at Ottawa, owing to the difficulty in a new settlement of finding proper men to send to Parliament, and the malign influences of the Capital, has failed to give her any real voice in the national councils, and on the most important occasions has proved true to the interests of the Ottawa Government, and false to those of its constituents. But above all, the region suffers by exclusion from the commercial pale of its continent, and from the general flow, not only of trade but of capital, of commercial enterprise, and of population which those within the pale enjoy. With the exception of a little flour sent to British Columbia, it sells nothing to any Canadian Province, and it is shut out of its natural market; nor is it much consoled by hearing that the Ottawa Government is endeavouring to open markets for it in Australia and Brazil. The artificial immigration of Skye Crofters, Icelanders, and others which it receives from Europe, though not to be despised, is of far less value than the natural immigration of Canadians and Americans who are born to the manner of its farming; and this it will not get in sufficient measure till the fatal barrier is removed. To the piling up of a vast debt, in spite of our immunity from military and diplomatic expenditure, the exodus of not a little of the very flower of our population, and the complete establishment

in the midst of us of a French and Papal nation, may be added, as a fruit of our policy during the last twenty years, the retarded prosperity of the North-West.

Winnipeg still feels one at least of the consequences of the Boom, inasmuch as she stands almost in a wilderness, the effect largely of the inordinate prices at which land was held in her early days and which drove settlement further West. But a reasonable measure of prosperity is assured to her in the end. She is the centre of the railway system; she is the centre of distribution; she is the centre of government, law, education and pleasure. She will grow, in time, as Toronto has grown. The universal passion for city life will tell in her favour. People who have made any money will come to her to spend it, and then they will come to live. Farming, which flourishes round Portage La Prairie, only fifty miles off, will presently extend to her fields. She has not yet gained much in extent, but she has gained in solidity, and the better buildings are an earnest of permanence and a sign of hope.

—By the proposal to introduce Sunday street cars in Toronto a question has been raised, which, though limited in its immediate scope, touches a vital interest of humanity. Few or none now cleave to the observance of the Jewish Sabbath. It not only belongs to the Jewish Dispensation, but was based on a literal acceptance of the Mosaic Cosmogony, which, unless religion is to be brought into direct collision with science must now be laid aside. Nor did it originally form any part of Christianity. Dr. Hesse, whose Bampton Lectures are the most complete treatise on the subject, after quoting the passage of St. Paul in which Sabbath days are coupled with new moons and other times and things, the observance of which, as obligatory, is condemned by the Apostle, pronounces that no testimony can be more decisive than this to the fact that the Sabbath was of obligation no longer. The observance of the

first day of the week as the Lord's Day was evidently a perfectly free Christian ordinance, though of the Jewish Christians some might cling to the Jewish practice, and be tolerated by their fellow-christians in so doing. Christianity seems to have undergone two or three successive superfetations. The first was that of Alexandrine and Byzantine theosophy, which loaded it with a great body of metaphysical dogma. The second was that of medieval priestcraft, which loaded it not only with a multitude of superstitious beliefs and practices, but with the usurped despotism of the Pope. The third and fourth were those of Reformation dogmatism on the one hand, and of the Tridentine reaction against the Reformation on the other. Justification by Faith as a dogma was evidently produced by antagonism to Indulgences, and to the whole medieval system of salvation by ecclesiastical observances, sacraments, penances and payments, of which Tetzel's money-chest was the extreme and most offensive manifestation, while Predestination almost necessarily flowed as a logical deduction from Justification by Grace. Antagonism was crystallized in dogma which was stereotyped in Protestant creeds. In the same way the Protestant revival of the Sabbath seems to have had its source in an extreme Biblicism, bred of the struggle against ecclesiastical authority, and the Roman Calendar as the work of that authority and an embodiment of saint-worship at the same time. But apart from all theological dogma, Jewish, Roman or Protestant, stands the great human necessity of the day of rest; of spiritual rest for those who are religious, of physical and mental rest even for those who are not. This necessity grows stronger as the stress and strain of life increase, while the tendency to encroach upon the day for the purposes, both of business and pleasure, grows stronger at the same time. Experience has proved that less than one day's rest in seven does not suffice; and without a stated interval of repose and calm, modern society, amidst the whirl of competition, speculation and excitement, would be almost in danger of going mad.

Nor can there be any doubt that the religious feeling about the day has hitherto been its strong safeguard, and kept at bay the aggression both of covetousness and dissipation. Denunciation of those who defend the observance of Sunday on religious grounds as fanatics or hypocrites is therefore out of place. Some arguments, which to say the least are hollow, have been used on the Liberal side. It is not for the purpose of attending distant places of worship that Sunday street cars are desired. Nor is there much force in the invidious remark that as the rich use their carriages the poor man ought to be allowed his street car. There are many rich who strictly abstain from using their carriages and make a point of giving all about them, as far as possible, the benefit of the day of rest. The really valid argument is, that without street cars the people who live in the middle of the city will be denied access to fresh air and healthy pleasure, and being mewed up in the streets will be consigned either to torpid dulness or to pleasures which are not so healthy. The change is evidently coming, and we can only hope that the Car Company will so arrange that none of those in their employment shall go without his day of rest. The case in favour of the change is strengthened by the encroachment which, in the sequel, will too probably be carried much further, on the Queen's Park; a cruel sacrifice of the health, not only physical but moral, of a great city, whose boys have no other playground, to a cheese-paring finance, which ought to have met with a strenuous resistance. But democracy does not seem to breed Hampdens, or if it does they are too much occupied by their commercial business, alike in New York and Toronto, to attend to a public wrong.

—Mr. Gooderham's bequest has probably settled the question as to the removal of Victoria College: at all events a Methodist College will be founded in the University of To-

ronto. Long ago THE BYSTANDER advocated Confederation on the grounds which he has never seen assailed, that the resources of this Province are not more than enough to maintain one university on a proper scale, and that starveling universities must lower the standard and may do social mischief by luring into intellectual callings a number of youths largely in excess of the demand. We therefore rejoice in a partial success, while we are sorry that it is only partial, and see that some difficulties may arise from the federation of a single college and one which is likely to be highly denominational in its character. Local interest and denominational feeling have, like the sons of Zeruah, proved too strong. There has also been at work a dislike, which is more rational, of political control, and in this respect it was perhaps unlucky that the Government was not represented on this occasion by a university man. It is easy to enter into the feelings of those Methodists who on religious grounds cling to the seclusion of Cobourg. Wesley, very likely, and Whitfield, almost certainly, would have done the same. But no seclusion short of that which is maintained in a Roman Catholic seminary will suffice. Impose what tests you will, and let your teaching be as rigidly orthodox as it may, with free access to bookstores and unrestricted intercourse, you will find that your separate University is a fortress with gates well guarded but without walls.

--In questions respecting appointments to Professorships, there should, we venture to think, be as little as possible of outside interference. It is wise on the most public grounds, as well as natural, to look first to your own *alumni*, because the appointments then act as prizes for home industry and effort. But the paramount consideration plainly is the interest of the student, which calls for the selection of the best teacher wherever he can be found. Patriotic preference of an inferior man will be punished by the intellectual leanness of the next academical generation.

N.S., No. 2.

NOVEMBER.

{ 10c. Single Number.
\$1.00 per year, post paid.

1889.

A MONTHLY
REVIEW

THE BYSTANDER

OF

CURRENT EVENTS,
CANADIAN AND GENERAL.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
The Equal Rights Movement.	41
Religious Toleration.	44
The Temperance Question.	48
Reciprocity.	53
The Three Americas.	55
Large Farms in the North-West.	56
Europe—Peace or War?	56
The Bye Elections in England.	58
Lord Salisbury on Imperial Federation.	58
The London Docks Strike.	59
The French Elections.	61
An American on the French Revolution.	61
Renan's Manifesto.	63
Copyright Legislation.	68
Canadian Literature.	71

Toronto:

HUNTER, ROSE & COMPANY, 25 WELLINGTON ST.
PUBLISHERS.

WHOLESALE AGENTS:

TORONTO NEWS CO., TORONTO.

MONTREAL NEWS CO., MONTREAL

HART & COMPANY,

Publishers and Booksellers.

LATELY PUBLISHED.

Voices and Undertones; in Song and Poem. —By WILLIAM P. MCKENZIE, B.A. (Toronto University), author of "A Song of Trust." Cloth; neat.....	\$1.25
Scenes in Hawaii; or Life in the Sandwich Islands. —By Mrs. FORSYTH GRANT. Cloth	1.00
Handy Reference Atlas of the World. —By JOHN BARTHOLOMEW. Composed of 76 Folio Plates, containing upwards of 100 Maps and Plans, also complete Index and Geographical Statistics. New handy size, Crown 8vo, 7½ x 8 inches	
Cloth, on guards, gilt edges, price.....	2.50
Morocco. " ".....	3.50

IN PRESS.

Great Hymns of the Church.—Original text and translations, etc., with notes and history of their origin. By Rev. DUNCAN MORRISON, M.A. Now in press, and expected to be ready early in December.

NEW BOOKS.

The Border or Riding Clans. —Followed by a History of the Clan Dickson. By B. HOMER DIXON, K. N. L. Price.....	5.00
Classical and Foreign Quotations, Law Terms and Maxims, Proverbs, Mottoes, Phrases and Expressions, in French, German, Greek, Italian, Latin, Spanish and Portuguese, with Translations, Reference, etc. By WM. FRANCIS HENRY KING, M.A., Oxford. Half leather, gilt top. Price.....	1.75
Names and Portraits of Birds which interest Gunners, with descriptions "In language understood of the people." By GORDON TRUMBULL.....	2.75
Sketches from a Tour through Holland and Germany. —By J. P. MAHAFFY and J. E. ROGERS. Illustrated.....	3.25
The Capitals of Spanish America. —By WILLIAM ELEROY CURTIS. Illustrated.....	3.75
Letters of Felix Mendelssohn to Ignaz and Charlotte Moschelles. —By FELIX MOSCHELLES. Illustrated.....	3.25
Essays on Some of the Modern Guides to English Thought in Matters of Faith. —By R. H. HUTTON.....	1.75

HART & COMPANY, Booksellers and Publishers.

31 and 33 KING STREET WEST, TORONTO.

FINE STATIONERY...

THE NEW DARK COLORED PAPERS—THE LATEST FASHION.

Blue Serge and Gobelins, with the White Stamping. Entirely New and Artistic.

NEW DESIGNS FOR MONOGRAMS AND ADDRESS DIES.

Visiting Cards, At Home Cards, Wedding Cards, Invitations engraved. Programmes, Menus and all Society Stationery printed or engraved in the most approved and fashionable styles.

SEND FOR SAMPLES.

HART & COMPANY.

Fine Stationers, Engravers, Embossers, Printers, etc.

31 and 33 King St. West, TORONTO

THE BYSTANDER.

DECEMBER, 1889.

IN describing the character and object of the Jesuits' Estates Act at Baltimore the other day, Mr. Mercier was bold and explicit. Amid loud cheers he spoke of it as "having repaired the despoilment of the Jesuits by the same George III. who had despoiled the American Revolutionary Fathers of their rights and liberties." It was intended as a reversal of the Conquest Settlement. It did deny the right of the crown and treated the exercise of that right as robbery. Where now are the soft subterfuges of the Minister of Justice? Are not those words of Mr. Mercier in themselves enough, if this is a British Colony, to warrant the protest against the Act?

At Quebec Mr. Mercier proclaimed that red and blue were to be blended in the Tricolor. From Quebec he telegraphed to the Pope the homage of the French Canadian nation. At Baltimore he changes his note and says that the tendency of his compatriots is not to nationality but to annexation. Plainly his opinions take their colour from his audience. Perhaps he also feels that he had hoisted the Tricolor a little too high. But if nationality is not the object, what is meant by the designation *Parti National*? The steadfast aim of Mr. Mercier's compatriots for the last quarter of a century has been to elbow the British and Protestant elements out of Quebec and make it a French and Papal community, which to all practical intents and purposes will be a separate nation. By some of the leaders this aim is openly avowed; those who

do not avow it still work for its attainment, and it is rapidly being attained. Such is the solid fact, avowed or unavowed, with which we have to deal. When Mr. Mercier himself threatens the minority in Quebec with reprisals, does he not imply that the minority are intruders and that Quebec is a French and Papal, not a British, Province?

—Political circles are still debating what effect the Equal Rights' movement will have on the Machines. It is a serious matter for those whom it concerns. Equal Rights men have simply done a plain duty to their country and humanity by opposing the endowment with public funds of a dark and murderous conspiracy, not against Protestantism only, but against civil rights and human freedom. If they have been baffled by the exigencies of political party bidding for the Irish Catholic vote and countenanced in its surrender of national right to the Papal encroachment by the representative of the Sovereign who sits on the throne of Elizabeth and William III., that is no fault of theirs; nor was it their business to inquire what the effect on Machine politics would be. We are quite prepared to see the Machines for the present reassert their power in the elections. It is surprising, and to the lover of freedom somewhat afflicting, to see to what an extent our people have been brought into thralldom to mere party names and Shibboleths. Conscience and substantial interest alike seem to give way at the crack of the party whip, and votes are cast for men who in private are admitted to be unworthy because they are the party nominees and because, if a scoundrel were thrown out, the Tory or the Grit, as the case may be, might come in. The phenomenon is not confined to Canada. Have we not just seen the farmers of the United States voting against that which clearly was, and which many of them knew to be, their own interest in the tariff question simply because they were "Republicans," though the name since the abolition of slavery has meant

nothing except the maintenance of a war tariff. We have the consolation of knowing on the best evidence that the intensity of partyism varies in inverse proportion to education, and your most fanatical Tory or Grit is a man who can barely read the campaign literature of his party; so that there is hope in the progress of intelligence. But such fetters are not to be struck off in a moment, especially when the wearers belong to a party which has a large bribery fund in its hands. Still the waters have been stirred; public feeling has been manifested on a question of principle in a manner which has impressed the politicians; and should the subject again come before Parliament we shall be surprised if the same servility or anything like the same levity is displayed.

Naturally, and it must be added, deservedly, the Liberal party suffers most. In allying itself with Jesuitism and Ecclesiasticism it has been guilty of a more flagrant breach of principle than the party which professes to be that of Reaction. It is also out; to get in it requires a motive power; whereas its rival, being in, has in its favour both the *vis inertiae* and the force by no means inert of patronage, and appropriations. Looking out for a principle to justify the existence of an organization is a curious reversal of natural order, but it is one with which the history of Party has made us familiar. One thing seems clear; the Liberals have no chance of bidding successfully against Sir John Macdonald or his lieutenants, Messrs. Langevin and Chapleau, for the support of the priest party in Quebec: the priest party knows whom it can thoroughly trust and to whom its gratitude for the passing of the Jesuits' Estates Act is really due. The only sound, or even possible, alliance for the Liberals in Quebec is with Liberals, that is to say, with the friends of Equal Right and Disestablishment. Of these, there may not at present be many, but their number will grow. Even sheep so patient as the *habitués* grow tired at last of being fleeced. We commend the consideration especially to young Liberals who have a political future.

In the progress of the controversy, the Jesuits' Estates Act has become almost a secondary matter and questions have been opened which the Machines have no more power to close than a steam engine has to alter the day of the week. The conflict between ecclesiastical aggression and civil right is just as irrepressible as was the conflict between slavery and freedom, though happily it is not likely to assume such tremendous proportions, or to be settled at such fearful cost. It extends, as daily events show us, over the States as well as over Canada, albeit there is not in the States a counterpart of the solid block of Ecclesiasticism and Papalism presented by Quebec. It extends to every part of the world in which the Church of the Middle Ages is still struggling for dominion. In an Australian review the other day there was an able and thoughtful essay on the institutions of the Colonies, the writer of which, after suggesting some improvements, wound up with the pensive remark that all improvements would be in vain so long as the Irish Catholic vote continued for objects of its own to hover between the parties, playing off one against the other and making honest and stable government impossible. The Catholic vote in Ontario is cast in the local election for Mr. Mowat's Government as the payment for patronage and Separate Schools. In the Dominion election which immediately follows it is transferred to the other party also for goods sold and delivered, the goods being the organic principles, the interests and honour of this Commonwealth. By way of turning the eye of the public from the mark and at the same time scaring the clerical leaders of the movement it has been said that the movement ought to be directed not against the encroachments of the Roman Catholic Church alone, but against those of the clergy generally. All bodies of men who possess influence are apt to take too much upon them, and when the clergy of any denomination do this, repression will become a duty. But the clergy of churches other than the Church of Rome do not pretend to temporal power; on the contrary, they with one voice abjure

it. The Church of Rome has always pretended and does still pretend to temporal power, or rather to temporal supremacy; her very last manifesto solemnly reasserts the claim and lays a curse on all who dispute it. In former times she sought to make it good by means of the swords of Catholic Kings; now she seeks to make it good by means of the votes of Catholic electors. Before she had to be encountered in the field and at the stake; she has now to be encountered at the polls.

In any resistance to the union of the temporal with the ecclesiastical power the place of honour is justly claimed by the Baptist Church, which held its conference in Toronto the other day. This, above all other Churches kept, in its true sense, the words of a Founder who said that His Kingdom was not of this world, while almost all other Churches have at one time or other more or less treated the words as if they meant that the Church of Christ was to renounce the sword where she was weak, but to use it where she was strong. To bring the pressure of a powerful Church vote to bear on a government for the aggrandizement of the Church, let it be remembered, is not less a breach of the great principle than the legal acceptance of State support. When we consider of what wars, massacres and murders political Churches, above all the great political Church of Rome, have been the cause, and how enormous also has been the scandal of their greed and corruption, that Christianity should still be received as a message of good-will, mercy and purity seems no small proof of its divine character.

—Another question has been raised which so far as Canada is concerned is perhaps more pressing still, though it cannot be of graver import. Quebec having now openly unfurled the standard of a French and Papal nationality, and the bearers of that flag having apparently the leaders of her people and the mass of her people itself with them, what are our future relations with her to be? **THE BYSTANDER** has the heartiest

sympathy with those who strive to make Canada a nation, and perhaps it may trace its own pedigree to the Canada First movement in which that aspiration was embodied. But there is no use in attempting manifest impossibilities, and no impossibility apparently can be more manifest than that of fusing or even harmonizing a French and Papal with a British and Protestant community. Mere political lines or uniformity of colouring on the map will not make a nation: if they would, Austro-Italy might have been a nation, and so might Holland and Belgium. To make a nation there must be a common life, common sentiments, common aims, and common hopes. Of these, in the case of Quebec and Ontario, there are none. Quebec tells us in the plainest terms that she is pursuing an ideal different from ours, that the connection is merely provisional, that she looks forward to being a nation of herself, and even in the end to supplanting us, and not only cancelling Wolfe's victory but realizing the visions of Louis XIV. If this were a sudden access of sentimental excitement it might pass away as it came; but it has been a steady growth, and moreover it is perfectly natural; a British colony conquered by France and feeling the conquerer's grasp relaxed by his fears would have done exactly the same thing. The extrusion of British population has at the same time been continually going on. Foreseeing the catastrophe, Lord Durham tried to avert it by union. Union failed and thereon followed a partial divorce under the deceptive name of Confederation. French nationality has all the time been gathering strength; at last it has found a leader and declared itself. What chance is there of subduing or absorbing it, and, if it can neither be subdued or absorbed, what chance is there of forming out of two masses, antagonistic in all respects, a united Canadian nation? Switzerland is cited as an example of the successful union of different races and religions. But in Switzerland the races and religions are intermingled; they do not confront each other, like opposing cliffs, as they do here. Moreover the territory of Switzerland is compact, with boundaries most clearly

traced by nature, and her union, which was formed under the strongest pressure of necessity, has endured through centuries, and has been consecrated by historic struggles. After all, Switzerland, when the Jesuit crept into her, had her civil war of religions.

Ontario by herself might be a nation. There is nothing at least in the nature of things, however much there may be in actual circumstances, to prevent her. She has sufficient unity of race, her territory is compact, and a strong British population would easily deal with any attempt which the wielders of her Irish Catholic vote might make to divide or dominate her in the interest of the Papacy. Her population is as large as that of Denmark; and if her resources could only be developed by free trade with her continent, it might in time equal that of Switzerland, Belgium or Holland. Quebec would hold the lower course of the St. Lawrence, but she would never venture to close it. Besides, now that we have direct railway access to the coast through Maine, a waterway which is closed for nearly half the year is likely to lose some of its importance. Even the Mississippi is less important than it was; and to retain it would hardly now be a sufficient motive for a four years' war.

The actual crisis may be deferred. The government of Sir John Macdonald may contrive to carry the Dominion elections in Quebec. To allow it to do this suits the policy of the Nationalist and Ecclesiastical party, which is thus enabled to prevent any interference of the Federal Parliament with its aims, and to draw on the Dominion treasury for its rather urgent financial needs at the same time. But though the Conservatives are allowed to carry Richelieu, the Nationalists, under their own flag, carry Joliette, and they purge the Club National of influences alien to their cause. Those who can see anything good and noble in itself, or tending to what is good and noble, in the management of Quebec and her retention within the pale of Confederation by means of patronage and government appropriations may have some years of satisfac-

tion and hope still before them. Something in the march of events here will be determined by the relations between the two mother countries. Mr. Hamerton, who has studied the French people most thoroughly and most sympathetically, says in his "French and English" that peace and courtesy may be maintained between the two nations, but that they never can be friends. It is too evident that Sedan has not effaced Waterloo.

—The signal success of Mr. Wiman's meeting at Toronto set two questions at rest. It proved that in the very centre of Separatism and Protectionism the desire for freedom of trade with our continent is strong, and it proved that in Canada public discussion is not to be put down by personal slander. To pretend that the meeting was not with Mr. Wiman is shameless: whether it was with the particular scheme could not be decided, as the scheme was not submitted to the vote; but it clearly was with the general object and with the injured man. Mr. Wiman called attention to the important fact that immense masses of English capital are being invested in the United States, so that England is acquiring an interest in the internal commerce of this continent which bears a large proportion to her interest in importation, while this vast redundancy of wealth is a pretty conclusive answer to the assertion that she has been impoverished by free trade. Very timely, too, was the warning to us in Toronto that our prosperity must ultimately depend on the condition of the farmer, and that we have consequently the deepest interest in any policy which will increase his earnings by giving him a better market. Our city is at present draining the country towns, most of which are consequently going backward: this is the source of her present growth; but it is a cornucopia which must presently cease to flow: we shall then have to look almost entirely to the farm, and the farm, let it be remembered, has been declining in value. Mr. Blue rates the depreciation since 1883 at twenty-two mil-

lions and a half. The farmer of Ontario moreover will be exposed in ever-increasing measure to competition with the harvests of the North-West, all forced in this direction by the tariff wall which bars their egress to the South. Belleville cries out that her prosperity is departing. Then let her support a policy which will bring it back again, instead of taking some petty bribe from the government and voting under the party-whip.

Is it not possible to advocate Commercial Union or a Zollverein without betraying the political independence of Canada? Hear what the Hon. Isaac Buchanan, Conservative patriot and Protectionist to boot, said at the conclusion of a review of the commercial situation in 1859: "The natural policy of Canada is seen clearly therefore to be the establishment of an American Zollverein, such as exists among the German States. Under this, the United States and Canada would neither of them levy any customs taxes on their interior frontiers, but only at the seaports from Labrador to Mexico—the same duties being levied and each country getting its share in the proportion of its population. Let it be therefore resolved that for our commercial system the principle should be adopted by Canada of an American Zollverein, or, in other words, free trade with America, but not with Europe. And this will be a fair compromise between the views of the two classes of friends of the Canadian farmer, one of which holds that our farmer is to be most benefited by general free trade and direct taxation, and the other by keeping our money in the country through the restriction of importations and indirect taxation." It is noteworthy that in commending his policy to the Americans Mr. Buchanan uses the very phrase which when used by Mr. Wiman has been distorted into treason. He says that a Zollverein "would give the Americans all the commercial advantages of annexation."

Mr. Buchanan was not always in the right; certainly he was not on the question of currency. But he clearly saw the great fact that the fiscal unity of the empire had been abandoned

and that Canada must thenceforth be at liberty to do the best she could for herself with reference to her own commercial circumstances, which are those of a community sharing this continent with the United States.

—The air has been full of rumours of a dissolution of the Legislature of Ontario. There could be no justification for such a step. No constitutional crisis to warrant an appeal to the people had arisen. There could be no assignable reason except a desire on the part of the holders of power to nip in the bud the Equal Rights' movement; in other words, to prevent public opinion from being fairly matured and finding expression at the polls. It is time to protest against the usurpation by the heads of party governments of a power of dissolving Parliament whenever it suits their convenience, and for the purpose of snapping a verdict. Such a practice, besides the turmoil and expense of frequent elections, would be subversive of the independence of Parliament, the members of which would hold their seats, not for the term for which the people in the exercise of its legal power has elected them, but during the pleasure of the Prime Minister. When to this usurped power of dissolution are added those of gerrymandering and of passing such party measures as the Franchise Act, together with a great command of patronage and government appropriations, there is no saying to what extent an unscrupulous Minister might entrench himself in power. Dissolution is the prerogative of the Crown, to be exercised for the purpose of providing the Sovereign with advisers who have the confidence of the people. In England we do not believe that the Sovereign would consent to a purely tactical dissolution. It is true that in 1874, when Mr. Gladstone was allowed to dissolve, there was no constitutional crisis; but Mr. Gladstone had been beaten the year before on the Catholic University question, had then resigned, and had consented to resume office only on the understanding that there was to be an early appeal to the

country. A heavy responsibility rests on the late Governor-General who abandoned to Sir John Macdonald the last prerogative of the Crown. The fact is that a Governor-General thinks of little beyond having a smooth passage through his term, and making a good fund of social popularity, which the English take for administrative success and accept as a certificate for higher employment. Yet the Governor-Generalship, with its seven Lieutenant-Governorships, must, since Confederation, have cost us in the aggregate something like six millions. This would be a heavy price to pay for figure-heads however beautifully gilded. We may fairly expect that the Governor General shall, at all events, act as the guardian of the British North America Act and see that the people enjoy the rights and securities which it gives them. To be just to Lord Lansdowne, let us say that he reduced the expenses of his office as much as possible, paying for his own trips over the country, whereas Lord Dufferin's trips to the West alone cost the Dominion twenty-eight thousand dollars.

—The *St. Thomas Journal* asks pertinently enough why the national veto on local legislation should be essential to the preservation of nationality in the case of Canada when it is not necessary in the case of the United States. Our answer is that in the first place there are in the United States checks of other kinds upon State action which we lack. The Governor's veto, unlike the veto of our Lieutenant-Governors, is a reality and is often used. There is sure access to the Supreme Court, whereas we see what a shifty government can do here. There is a power of amending the Constitution, which has been used for example to put an end to Slavery with its disruptive tendencies, whereas our Constitution is locked up in the keeping of an Imperial Legislature to which it is hopeless to appeal. Besides in the last resort the national government of the United States possesses and has used on the largest scale the power of coercion, whereas the Dominion has no such power, and Quebec

knows well that the Imperial Government will never venture to interpose with force. But more than all, the American Commonwealth, now that slavery has been eliminated, is homogeneous and moves of itself with sufficient uniformity on a national line, the same political parties with identical aims and issues pervading its whole frame. The Dominion, on the contrary, has in the midst of it a subaltern nationality, French and Papal, with distinct aims of its own, and unless the action of this subaltern nationality is controlled by a central authority, so as to keep it in tolerable unison with that of the Federal nationality, the federation, will become a mere league. A league with a French and Papal nation, the *St. Thomas Journal*, we believe, does not desire.

—The West Lambton Election was the old story—the two Machines bidding a gainst each other for the Catholic vote and victory in the Dutch auction remaining, as was natural, with the Mowat machine, which beyond doubt has the strongest claims to ecclesiastical gratitude. The outcome to the Province, as usual, is ecclesiastical domination. No Equal Rights candidate was in the field, the Association having expressly declined to take part on this occasion; but an Anti-Machine candidate, who combined Equal Rights with Prohibition and Third Party, polled a vote respectable in itself, and which, if it were added to the Conservative vote, would turn the scale. The Opposition perhaps in time will learn its lesson. Its leader by hauling down his flag before the last general election did not gain a single Catholic vote. The priest knows who is his true friend in Ontario. If the Opposition is to be led as it is now, it may as well disband at once; indeed it had better; for all it does now is to mask the responsibility of the Government. Sir John Macdonald said that Mowat must go. But did he mean it any more than he meant that he was dying to catch Riel? The Catholic vote is given to Mr. Mowat in the Province and then to Sir John in the Dominion. This arrangement proba-

bly suits Sir John well, and it would be at once disturbed if life were put, by the only conceivable means, into the Ontario Opposition. The men who occupy the place of leaders of the party did not even show themselves in the Riding. Independence of Ottawa seems to be the first condition of an effective Opposition in Ontario. Another condition, however, is the appearance of some stronger men than Mr. Meredith has at his side.

—In Sir Richard Cartwright's fierce indictment of the Government there was much that is only too familiar. No one can doubt that we are governed to a deplorable extent, by corruption, or that the consequence is the demoralization of a community well fitted by nature, if ever a community was, for the working of representative institutions. Indeed Sir Richard's instances were not taken from the worst class of all. When, on the eve of a general election, a Prime Minister assembles the representatives of a particular commercial interest in the parlour of a hotel, takes from them subscriptions for his election fund, and virtually pledges to them in return the commercial policy of the country, corruption assumes its most dangerous and noxious form. The most novel and startling count in Sir Richard Cartwright's indictment was that relating to the corruption of the Press. It would be difficult to substantiate the charge by proving the motives with which advertisements and printing patronage are given: but when a government such as ours spends two or three hundred thousand dollars a year on the journals we may be sure that a sinister influence is exercised, and that poison, to use Sir Richard's apt metaphor, is cast into the well of public truth. The excuse, as has been said before, is the difficulty of holding together provinces geographically scattered, differing in race and without unity of commercial interest. This may amount almost to a plea of necessity. But the system is not the less immoral or the less injurious to the political character of the people.

—In scattering benedictions over the North-West the Governor-General has bestowed a share on the Mormon settlement. We are assured by Mr. Mackenzie Bowell that none of the settlers are living in polygamy. The sect, however, is nothing if not polygamic; a detachment of it is rather a sinister accession to our civilization; and Mr. Bowell is hardly to be congratulated on having to appear at once as the champion of Jesuitism in the East and of Mormonism in the West. Shreds of outlandish nationalities and equivocal sects—Icelanders, Skye Crofters, Mennonites, and Mormons—are hardly the stuff out of which a strong, sound, and patriotic community is made. Of the motley collection the Icelanders are probably the best. The Mennonites are materially the most prosperous, but their prosperity is very material: they generally decline the duties of citizenship, and when they do vote are said to be weak. To transport the herdsmen and fishermen of Skye from the mild air of the Hebrides and set them to farming in the North-West was not an unquestionable act of benevolence, though it may be hoped that their children will do well. What the North-West wants is the Canadian immigration which is now peopling Dakota, Minnesota, Montana, and Washington Territory. But this it will not get, nor will it enjoy, in any respect, its destined measure of prosperity until it has thrown down the tariff wall and brought itself within the commercial pale of its Continent. Manitoba wishes for rest after her struggle against railway monopoly. This is natural; but in time, having gained freedom of construction she will have to strike for freedom of trade over the road. The country will not fill up while it is commercially kept out in the cold. The writer of a Tory account of Canada and Canadian sentiment in the *Quarterly Review*, the other day, had sufficient confidence in the faith of his readers to tell them that there was a cordon of towns and villages from Port Arthur to Vancouver. In the whole of the region, two thousand miles long and of infinite breadth, there are not, we will venture to say, more than two hundred thousand whites, say one-fifth of a man

to the square mile of the habitable area; and this twenty years after the assumption of the territory by the Dominion.

—The country gave a guarantee for thirteen millions to indemnify the C. P. R. for the surrender of a monopoly to which, as far as Manitoba was concerned, the Company never had a right. Having got the guarantee the Company, with the manifest connivance of the Government, maintained the monopoly by blocking the construction of the rival railway. It is now doing the same thing again, and as before with the connivance of the Government, the object probably being to secure the exclusive handling of this year's harvest. So at least Manitobans are complaining. But, as Sir Richard Cartwright says, if any one calls attention to the wrong in Parliament, he will be voted down, perhaps without debate, by a majority at the command of the Government. Not only so, but Manitoba herself, as likely as not, at the next election, lured by some paltry and perhaps illusory bribe, will send up representatives to uphold the wrong. "Considerable indignation," says the *Winnipeg Sun*, is felt over the matter. Then let the people, instead of merely "feeling" indignation, show it.

—A curious letter signed "Maple Leaf" appeared the other day in the *Toronto Telegram*. It was written in support of a proposal to treat the English subjects of Her Majesty as aliens and impose on them a year of naturalization as a condition of eligibility to municipal office. From this it went on to inveigh with extreme bitterness against English immigration. Other writers have followed in the same strain. We believe the letter to have been a symptom of a feeling, which though unavowed, is growing. There is a singular contrast in this respect between American and Canadian sentiment. To Americans England is an object of traditional hatred; yet the Eng-

lishman is received by them without the slightest prejudice on the ground of nationality and made heartily welcome to everything to which he is eligible by law. Canadians, while they profess and no doubt feel great love of England, are disposed in an increasing degree to look upon the English immigrant as an interloper. The appointment of an Englishman to any office or place, even in a bank, excites jealousy, and it appears to be easier for Americans than for Englishmen to make their way here in public life. The true explanation no doubt is, not that Canadians are unkind, but that in the last generation immigrants from the Imperial country enjoyed a preference approaching to a monopoly, of which the memory lingers in the minds of the natives who are now determined to have Canada to themselves. With this perhaps is combined a suspicion that natives of an Imperial country imagine themselves superior to colonists, so that the jealousy may be looked upon as one of the moral incidents of Colonial dependence. It is only in Old Canada that the English immigrant has this adverse feeling to encounter : in the North-West there can be no nativism, because there are no natives.

—The Harvey case raises once more the solemn question as to the conditions of capital punishment. For our part we incline to the stern opinion that, if a man takes human life knowingly and under no hallucination or misconception, his life ought to be taken. No one would propose to hang a lunatic who did not know what he was doing or a man who imagined he was defending himself against a robber and assassin. But the plea of criminal propensity, we think, ought not to be heard. It is to compel men to restrain their criminal propensities that the law is made. If criminal propensity were to be a ground of acquittal a man by indulging his evil passions till they became his masters might qualify himself for cutting our throats with impunity. It is very likely that the criminal propensity of "Jack the Ripper" has become uncontrollable.

Medical experts ought not to be heard unless they can attest positive hallucination. When they say that a propensity is uncontrollable they only mean, at least they can only prove, that it has not been controlled. If a man has really been miscreated the responsibility for the necessity to which society is driven of protecting itself against the influence of his example by putting him out of the way must rest with the Creator. Motives are a ground not for acquittal but for pardon or commutation. Nobody would propose to let the law take its course in the case of a modern Virginus. What we ought to do with an Othello it might be difficult to say ; but we know what an Othello does with himself. When a man has committed a wilful homicide without a palliating motive, surely it is better for him as well as for society that he should leave the world. What is life worth in a criminal lunatic asylum or a solitary cell?

—American politicians believe in a mysterious law by which the Republicans are doomed to lose at the off-elections. It is possible that the party may contain more than its share of those quiet citizens who go to the poll only on great occasions. Whatever may be the cause, there can be no doubt in the present instance about the effect. The Republicans have lost and lost heavily. Nor can we doubt that Mr. Cleveland is right in saying that the leaven of Free Trade works. In the farmer's mind all leaven works slowly and this combined with the strategical error committed as we think in the introduction of the Mills Bill accounts for the failure of the farmers to support their own cause at the last election. But even the farmers must begin to see the flagrant folly and iniquity of a system which takes from the people a hundred millions a year and squanders them in pensions to protect the inordinate gains of master manufacturers. The Republican Government has had to put a limit to the use of that waste-pipe. It will probably next try to get rid of surplus by large appropriations for washing the blackamoor white. But the end must come. Protectionism has

hitherto been supported by the mechanics in the belief that it raises wages ; but the increased vote cast by artisans in favour of Free Trade at the last Presidential Election shows that this fallacy is losing hold. To withdraw all at once the foundation, however erroneous, on which the industrial edifice has been built, would plainly be dangerous, and many who in principle are Free Traders will desire to move cautiously on that account. The same thing may be said with regard to our Protectionist policy in Canada. But tariff reform is coming and it will help us to Continental Free Trade. The Republican party itself, we repeat, can have no better policy than that which would reduce revenue while it extended trade.

—So quiet and commercial a transaction as the termination of monarchy in Brazil can hardly be called a revolution. It seems to have been brought about mainly by mistrust of the clerical tendencies of the heiress and her consort. Not unlikely Pedro himself foresaw a catastrophe. There is no great change, since the monarchy was constitutional, and the monarch, we are told, at New York rode to his hotel in a hack robed in a common duster. Yet the news sounds like the passing bell of Old World institutions in the New World. We are now fairly face to face with Democracy, and while the foolish and thoughtless will exult as if humanity had finally entered into a political Paradise the wise and thoughtful will bend themselves more earnestly than ever to the arduous task of making democracy a government not of popular will but of the reason and conscience of the community. The will of the people no more constitutes a right than the will of a despot; nor, if this is a moral world, is it a better and surer foundation for a polity. Feeble attempts to engraft aristocracy on Canada by means of titles or the influence of the little court at Ottawa will share the fate of the attempt to engraft monarchy on Brazil. We must frankly accept the dispensation and for real and lasting safeguards look to democracy itself organized on the principal not of anybody's will but of duty.

—Our diagnosis of the situation in England received speedy confirmation. Mr. Gladstone was to have declared his Irish policy at Southport, but he did not. Why? Because the Brighton election, which he hoped to win, was at hand and he knew that he would spoil his chance by raising the issue of the Union. Home Rule for the present is laid aside. No plan is before the country. Mr. Gladstone's original scheme is so dead that his doubting followers are beginning to take advantage of its decease as a door of escape from their quandary, declaring that to it and to it alone their adhesion was given, and that their Home Rule affections are buried in its grave. The dilemma is fatal: the Irish members must either be excluded from the Parliament at Westminster or not. If they are, Home Rule, in the present mood of the Irish at all events, means separation. If they are not, how determine the special subjects on which they are to be allowed to vote? To draw a line between Imperial and British questions would be found impracticable. The policy of every government or governing assembly is an organic whole, the parts of which have constant reference to each other. If in a debate on a question of peace or war something was said about British finance, could the Speaker bid the Irish members withdraw? A proposal to federalize one member of the United Kingdom while the rest is left on the national footing is like a proposal to federalize one of a man's arms or legs. If Federation is your aim, restore the Heptarchy. Retrace the boundaries of the old Saxon Kingdoms, make London again, as it probably was in Saxon times, a State of itself, revive the division of Northumbria into Bernicia and Deira, that of Wales into its Principalities, that of Scotland into Lowlands and Highlands, that of Ireland into the four Provinces. Then you will have a group of States nearly equal among themselves or at least free from any obnoxious superiority, and thus suitable for Federation, whereas a Federation of England, Scotland, Ireland and Wales would be a perpetual domination of England over the smaller countries and a perpetual cabal of the smaller countries against England.

The only objections to such a plan are, first, that it is not so easy to draw off the life of a nation into a number of separate receptacles as it is to draw off liquor from a cask into bottles ; and secondly, that Great Britain, a power, with all her faults, of justice and of progress, would be erased from the map of the diplomatic world. Home Rule, however, for the present at least, is dead. A Radical victory at the next general election is possible and it might bring Home Rule as part of a revolutionary programme in its train, but a victory of Home Rulers on the direct issue there will not be. By the part which Canada, through her legislatures, has been made to play in countenancing and stimulating the attempt to dismember the Mother Country, the politicians may have gained Irish Catholic votes, the country has taken nothing but dishonour. Let it not be forgotten that it was the Tory leader who began the game. Sir John Macdonald is very indignant with those who say that his conduct with regard to the Jesuits' Estates Act was influenced by fear of the French vote. What influenced his conduct with regard to the Costigan Resolutions ?

—The Salisbury Government is preparing to make a grand effort to settle the Irish land question. No one who knows Ireland doubts that this is the root of the trouble. The political agitation springs out of it and would die if the land question were settled, everywhere at least except in the hot heads of Dublin and Cork. To do away with dual ownership is no doubt the object of the scheme. But is it certain that the abolition of landlordism will do away with dual ownership ? Will not the result be for the landlord to substitute the mortgagee ? The Canadian and American farmer is incomparably more thrifty than the peasant, miscalled a farmer, of Celtic Ireland is likely for generations to be. Yet Canadian and American farms are heavily mortgaged. Such a change would be a doubtful gain, since the landlord, unless he is very bad, does some sort of duty and in hard times is merciful : the mortgagee knows no

duty and no mercy. It will not be surprising if out of the grave of the agitation for the plunder of landlords should rise an agitation for the plunder of mortgagees, since the Irishman has now been taught by demagogues the poisonous lesson that plunder is easier than thrift and agitation much pleasanter than industry. Moreover, behind the difficulty of land tenure lies that of overpopulation. The one indeed partly gives rise to the other, since it was by the desperate bidding of peasants against each other for the holdings that the rents were inordinately raised. Ireland, let agrarian demagogues say what they will, has a climate unsuited to cereals, and can maintain a large population only on the potato. But the Celtic Irish, encouraged by their Church, multiply recklessly like the people of Quebec who, in spite of their comparative thrift, would be liable to famine, if they had not a ready outflow into the States. Nothing will work a thorough cure in Ireland but copious depletion, followed by the uprooting of the potato; and this, it is to be feared, could be effected only by a strong government acting without interruption from demagogism for twenty or thirty years.

In the political line one grievance and one only through the whole course of this agitation has been named. It is hard upon Ireland to have to go to Westminster for her private bill legislation. There would surely be no danger in letting a Parliamentary Committee sit at Dublin during the recess for private bills. It would have to report to Westminster, and if it grew restive the ready remedy would be to let it drop. It might, at the same time, cure, as it were by vaccination, the desire for a separate Parliament. This would be a more wholesome concession, at all events, than a lay Maynooth, under the name of a Catholic University, which, besides being a seminary of obscurantism, such as no free and progressive government can consistently found, would to a certainty become a hot-bed of sedition.

Mr. William Pilkington, introducing himself as an Anglo-Irish farmer and land-agent of long experience, in his "Help for

Ireland," tells us something about "land-burning" which seems to show that all the woes of Ireland do not come from the Union. Land-burning was the process of burning the surface of the soil, which, by precipitating the phosphate, produces a great yield, especially of potatoes, for two or three years, after which the land is ruined. Burned land was taken, Mr. Pilkington says, largely by young couples who waited only to get a plot of potatoes ripe before they went to the priest. In the land-burning times Mr. Pilkington has known the banns for thirty-seven couples published in one day and more than a hundred marriages solemnized in the same parish in one week. According to certain theorists the result ought to have been great opulence, since the more producers there are the greater (except in very small islands) will be the product. You may "relegate political economy to Saturn," but it has a trick of coming back. That all the people whom such young couples bring into the world can be found not only in bread but in education, leisure and happiness, as optimistic philanthropy now seems to assume, is glad tidings if it is true, and any change of economical organization by which it would be brought about ought to be heartily welcomed by us all.

—There is a point at which, in mid-revolutionary career, even Mr. Gladstone calls a halt. The nationalization of land, he says, without compensation would be sheer robbery, with it would be sheer folly. Mr. John Morley, Jacobinical though he is, echoes the judgment. To take from a man the land which he has bought with the full sanction of the community, signified through its laws, and perhaps bought of the nation itself,—if this is not robbery, what is? Under what form or name the robbery is to be committed, and whether the instrument is to be the bludgeon, the bayonet, or the taxing power, matters nothing. There can be no doubt that the writer of "Progress and Poverty" means confiscation and rejoices in it, though the victims, by his own showing, are guilty

of nothing but ignorance of his discovery. Land, he and his disciples say, is the gift of God, and therefore cannot be rightfully appropriated by man. The wool in Mr. Henry George's coat, the leather in Mr. Henry George's boots, the metal in Mr. Henry George's types, are equally the gift of God. Besides, if land is the gift of God, and therefore incapable of appropriation, it ought to be humanized, not nationalized. A nation has no more right to appropriate it than a man.

When all the land has been seized into the hands of a set of politicians, idealized as "the State," what is to follow? Is it to be let out again to the present holders, or is there to be a redistribution? Who is to have the good land, who the bad? Mr. George says that every child born into the world has a title to a share in the land. Is there then to be redistribution every time a child is born or grows up? Or, as the land belongs to us all, are we all to squat upon it at our pleasure? Supposing the land is to be let out, are the holdings to be secure or not? If they are, we have private property in land again; if they are not, labour will not be put into the land, and the result of public robbery will be, as it has always been, cessation of industry and dearth of bread.

It is happily not true that poverty has increased with progress. The area of comfortable living has immensely increased, both in itself and relatively to the amount of want and suffering. The amount of want and suffering has of course positively increased with the growth of population and the increased scale of fluctuations in trade. Destitution arises from a vast variety of causes, physical and moral, quite independent of anything in the tenure of land, and is found in full measure in commercial communities, like Holland, where the land is a secondary matter, and Venice, where there is no land at all. If the landlords have swallowed up all the wealth of the community, where did the Rothschilds, Vanderbilt, and Jay Gould get their riches? The supposed discovery on which the whole theory is based is itself a mare's nest. It is not true that the labourer gives his labour to the capitalist in advance of pay:

he begins to draw his pay, as soon as his wages are secured to him, in credit and can go at once to the store.

These robbers who have wrongly appropriated the land in every community of the world, who are they? What has history to tell us about them? They are no more historical than the priests who everywhere invented religion. In Russia, Hindostan and Afghanistan there linger vestiges of tribal ownership, which has spontaneously and independently been discarded by the nations generally in favour of the system of private ownership, experience having taught that private ownership produced the best tillage and the most food. The true test of a system of land tenure, though land reformers hardly ever notice it, is production. That system is the best which gives the community most bread.

Mr. George and his disciples propose to confiscate the land : another set of men proposes to confiscate the property of all the stockholders in railroads. Public plunder is in the air and the thought excites envy and malignity as well as greed. Property, like all the other parts of our state, like the whole universe, so far as it comes within our ken, is full of defects and attendant evils : the faculties by which it is acquired are not more justly distributed than health, strength or life ; but it is the only known motive-power of production : when its security is destroyed, as it was by the robberies of the French Revolution, as it would be by the adoption of Mr. George's scheme of confiscation, production ceases and famine ensues. To defend it against confiscation therefore is to defend the life of the community. The best defences of property, as well as the only sure source of happiness to its holders, are to be found in the performance of social duty, and in steadfast effort to improve the common lot. But one has only to read certain Socialistic or "Labour" journals to know that there are some who are not to be satisfied or reconciled in this way, who, for the gratification of their envy and hatred no less than of their greed are bent on confiscation, and with whom in the end there may be battle, as indeed there has already been in more

than one European country, and on a smaller scale upon this Continent. It seems hardly to occur to the philosophers of this school that the multitude of innocent people whom, as a first step towards the extirpation of poverty, they propose to reduce to beggary, will resist, and that the "ransom" which communistic brigandage demands of property-holders may be paid in the only metal which ever satisfied a highwayman. But of "ransoms" let us hear no more. For lawful property no ransom is due. Let those who hold it be ready to defend it against the philanthropic robber as their right, while they use it as a trust in the eye of God.

Do away with all the difficulties derived from feudal law or professional pedantry which have hitherto beset the purchase of land. Introduce everywhere the Torrens System which, owing largely to the exertions of Mr. Herbert Mason, has been making way in this country. Let acquisition be perfectly free to all members of the community. Multiply, as much as sound economy permits, the number of possessors. This is the true and the only sane nationalization of land.

In his lecture at Toronto the other night, Mr. Henry George occupied himself less in the advocacy of his own panacea than in the confutation of Protectionism. Here he has an easy game. For of all the commercial schemes, though not the most immoral the most absurd, is that which proposes to make communities rich by taxation.

—The passage of the Atlantic in less than six days by the *City of Paris* draws the Continents very close together. Now let an antidote to sea-sickness be discovered and there will be almost a fusion of the wealthier classes in America and Europe. Every extension of man's power and facilities is sure to prove good in the end, but at first great facility of locomotion is not without its drawbacks. It begets restlessness and tempts the wealthy to leave their posts of social duty. The rich men of this Continent especially are tempted to go where their wealth

can be better enjoyed, as it can in the more brilliant society and the more perfect services of Europe. Yet unless the rich will stay at their posts and do their duty, there will be social trouble and that soon. A visit to the Old World is to the intellectual class almost a part of education, but the rich man is not educated or in any way improved by lounging away his time in the pleasure cities and watering-places of Europe. The temptation is great, especially when men of wealth and refinement are deprived of their natural objects of interest and ambition by exclusion from public life. Yet it must be overcome if Society on this Continent is to remain sound. Of the social and agrarian trouble in the United Kingdom, especially in Ireland, the cause in no small measure is the absenteeism of landlords which has taken away the keystone from the arch of the manorial system. Politics happily are not the only social work of man: other work less ambitious and exciting, yet not less fruitful and better perhaps for the heart, may be found. The life of a wandering sybarite, without a fixed home or home duties, chasing from one pleasure-haunt to another the shadow of happiness which he can find in none, is pitiable and grows more pitiable as it draws near its end. Nothing can be less enviable than the American colony in Paris. Pleasure itself, supposing it the chief aim of life, is not complete without a spice of duty. But, we repeat, serious danger impends over pleasure, wealth and all, unless social duty is done.

Amidst the signs and rumblings of social war special interest attaches to the history of the industrial insurrection under Wat Tyler. By Professor Thorold Rogers the rising has been ascribed to the attempt of the lords to keep down wages which had risen in consequence of the reduction of population by the Black Death. Professor Ashley in the *Political Science Monthly* seems inclined to ascribe the outbreak more to the levelling doctrines, anticipative of the Socialism of the present day, with which the preaching of John Ball and his compeers had filled the air and which incited the villeins to withhold feudal dues and services from the lords, whose

attempt to enforce their claims brought on the storm. Our own impression is that the catastrophe was due to a complication of causes, social and economical, among which we should certainly include the preaching of the Wycliffite Levellers and probably the improvement in the condition of the serfs which led them to aspire to a still greater change of their state, as Socialism takes hold of the highly paid mechanics of the present day. But something, we suspect, was also due to the non-residence of the lords who, like the French nobility of a later day, had exchanged the country for the Court and instead of performing their duties on their estates and keeping up their social influence had been thronging the gay Chaucerian Court of Edward III., banqueting at the Round Table in his newly built castle palace, glittering in the tilt-yards of a galvanized chivalry, and following the king and his adventurous son to glory and plunder on foreign fields. It has been noted that the districts of France to which the Revolutionary movement did not extend were those in which the landowners had continued resident.

—If the Americans believe that Abraham Lincoln was “the greatest man since Christ,” let them save his ashes from profanation. His ashes are profaned when prurient curiosity is fed, as it has been by a recent biographer, with the miserable details of his domestic unhappiness and the quarrels between him and his wife, caused by his opening the door in his shirt-sleeves or cutting the butter with his own knife. The lust of scandal is becoming a madness. Scandal about aristocracy above all is luscious. It was a sad disappointment when a jury acquitted the Earl of Galloway of a disgusting offence, though a conviction would have brought misery not only on him but on a family too high-placed to escape the pointed finger of malignity. This passion for aristocratic scandal is nothing but flunkeyism turned upside down. The same people would grovel at the feet of a lord. People of the same

class are trying to get Sir Charles Dilke back into Parliament. Closely connected with this tendency is the growing disregard of privacy and social confidence. A man in good society has no scruple in making a telling magazine article out of conversations which he has heard at private dinner parties. Dr. Lushington, Lady Byron's counsel, amidst all the foul controversy on that subject, kept his professional secret and carried it with him to the grave. Had he been born in these times he would have sent at once for a reporter.

—Nobody wishes unnecessarily to revive the hateful memories of religious persecution, but when the apologists of the Jesuit, to throw a mantle over his character and acts, tell us that Protestants and Roman Catholics have "alike" reason to blush for the deeds that have been perpetrated by their adherents, we must beg leave to demur to the perversion of historical justice for a political purpose. For centuries Christendom had been dominated by a power which treated heterodoxy as crime and practised every form of persecution, renouncing thereby, as clearly as deeds could renounce it, the inheritance of Him whose Kingdom was not of this world. The evil belief thus ingrained did not at once depart when the Papacy was overthrown, nor did Protestantism at first know of what spirit it was. But what are all the sins of Protestantism in this way put together compared with the extermination of the Albigenses, the autos-da-fe and torture-houses of the Spanish Inquisition, the persecution in the Netherlands, where Alva alone could say that he had put to death eighteen thousand persons, the persecution in France under Francis I., the massacre of St. Bartholomew, which the Pope celebrated by a solemn thanksgiving and by commemorative pictures, medals and orations, the extermination of Protestantism by the sword in the Dominions of the House of Austria and the Dragonnades in France, to say nothing of the civil wars kindled by the Popes for the destruction of

heresy or the dethronement of heretical Princes? Such atrocities as were perpetrated by Protestants on Catholics in the Low Countries were not measures of religious persecution but acts of vengeance excited to frenzy by the far greater atrocities of Alva and his fellow persecutors. Protestantism, if unhappily it did in some cases punish public profession, never scrutinized conscience with the rack. Cromwell prohibited the Mass, but he disclaimed all inquisition into conscience. The darkness of course lingered longest in the countries least advanced in civilization. Scotland in 1697, when a young man was hanged for blasphemy, was still in a very barbarous condition, and the temper of the people had been rendered cruel by the persecution of the Covenanters under James II. It is pretended that this took place after persecution in Roman Catholic countries had ceased. It was nearly contemporary with the extermination of the Huguenots. The autos-da-fe in Spain and Portugal went on far into the next century, and one took place in Mexico so late as 1815. In France the religious murder of Calas took place in 1762, and that of La Barre in 1766, while in 1731 the Prince Bishop of Salzburg expelled the whole of the Protestant population, 30,000 in number, from his territories. But this is not the whole, nor even the most important part, of the case. The most important part of the case is that Protestantism with one voice now disclaims the principle of persecution and bewails every act of persecution that was ever committed in its name; while Rome in her last manifesto distinctly reaffirms the principle of persecution by anathematizing all who deny that she has the right to use the temporal power for the enforcement of her creed, and so late as 1867 canonized the cruel inquisitor Peter Arbues. To bring the fact nearer home, Father Gingras, of Quebec, in a pamphlet which has often been quoted, has an unqualified defence of the Inquisition. "The excessive cruelty of the Inquisition! pure calumny, gentlemen, never was a criminal tribunal more humane." Ask a Jesuit whether he renounces persecution and condemns the

members of his Order who took part with the persecuting Popes and Inquisitors as we condemn Calvin for the execution of Servetus. That many Roman Catholic laymen are now in their personal belief perfectly tolerant we know, but what we have to deal with on the present occasion is not Catholicism, the religious faith of the Middle Ages, as to which we only say that it belongs to the past, but the conspiracy set on foot in aid of the Roman Catholic reaction by Ignatius Loyola.

That the Papacy was the friend of freedom in the Middle Ages is another historical fallacy which is also being revived on this occasion. That the despotism of the Popes limited the despotism of Kings as one encroaching force limits another by mere collision is true; but in no other sense is it true that the Papacy was the friend of freedom. Till King John had submitted, the Pope was willing to take advantage of the disaffection of the Barons, but when John had submitted and become the vassal of the Roman See the Pope annulled the Great Charter and prohibited its observance under pain of excommunication. Fanciful historians have represented the opposition of Becket backed by the Papacy against Henry II. as a struggle for the liberty of serfs to enter the priesthood, which had been restricted by an article in the Constitution of Clarendon, and have given the Church credit for upholding the rights of the people against feudal tyranny. Unluckily the Constitutions of Clarendon were brought before the Pope at the Council of Sens, and His Holiness having divided the articles into those which were intolerable and those which might be tolerated, placed in the latter class the article restricting the ordination of serfs. There is no use in trying to make out that the slavery of the soul is the freedom of the man.

—In the ecclesiastical world, as it, is imaged by recent conventions in the United States, the chief movement discerned is a revolt in the Protestant Churches generally against

dogmatic formularies, which, as we have had occasion before to remark, are in great measure the antagonisms of the sixteenth century crystallized into tests, Justification by Faith in its extreme form being the expression of antagonism to Indulgences, while Predestination is the logical though not the moral corollary of Justification by Faith. It is not surprising that the religious conscience, awakened and enlightened by inquiry, should struggle against its bonds. Nor is it surprising that peculiar uneasiness should be excited by the dogma of Predestination. No ingenuity can reconcile a belief in the article of the Westminster Confession on that subject with a belief in the justice of God. The sophistries of Necessarianism which Jonathan Edwards has with such calamitous skill pressed into the service of his terrible creed may perplex the understanding but cannot possibly confound the moral sense. The iron chain of causation on which his theory depends cannot really be regarded as having its initial link in man, or even in the first Father of the race; it must be traced up to the Creator, who is responsible for all effects of the First Cause. It is true that without Free Will goodness and badness, simply as noxious or beneficent qualities, may exist in man as well as in animals, plants or minerals; but sin cannot exist without Free Will, nor without sin can punishment, much less everlasting punishment, for sin be just. The process of revising formularies in an age of criticism and general disintegration is arduous; those who are summoned to undertake it cannot help feeling that they are asked to open a flood-gate which may let in an overwhelming flood; and the relaxation of tests naturally suggests itself as an easier and safer policy than the reconstruction or expurgation of doctrine. The Church of Rome looking on at all this perplexity and distress of conscience will exult in the august simplicity of a system which stands in need of no tests, but only requires blind faith and absolute obedience. The answer to her taunts is that what she has to deplore is not perplexity or distress of conscience within her communion, but the revolt and practical secession of entire

nations. In France, that "eldest daughter of the Church," the mass of the male population cares no more for the Papal religion than for that of Jupiter, and in Italy the statue of Giordano Bruno is erected amidst general acclamations at the very door of the Pope.

—Sir William Dawson is one of the first practical geologists of the day and a work by him is above our criticism. His "Handbook of Geology" deals with the great geological periods as well as with the general principles of the science. The work is of special interest to Canadians, inasmuch as fully one half of it deals with the geology of the Dominion. This section treats of the geological structure of (1) the Acadian region; (2) Old Canada; (3) the prairie plateau of Manitoba and the North-West; (4) the mountain ranges of British Columbia, with a glance at the physical features and glacial deposits of Newfoundland and the Arctic basin. Were the tariff wall only removed and liberty given to us of developing our vast mineral resources, the value of Sir William Dawson's book as an economic manual would be greatly increased.

Mr. Homer Dixon's "Border Clans" deals with a subject about which little has been written, though it filled the imagination of Walter Scott, who loved to wander in the Border dales and to trace the vestiges of the wild marauding life in the local character which he has embodied in Dandie Dinmont. The book has a genealogical as well as an historical interest, for the bearers of many well-known names—Johnston, Scott, Kerr, Dickson, Rutherford, Irving, Elliot, Armstrong, Foster, Henderson—appear in Mr. Dixon's list. Some of the names had special epithets attached to them, but it is to be hoped that the quality is not hereditary in the case of "the angry Kerrs." The last chapter has only a family interest.

N.S., No. 4.

JANUARY.

{ 10c. Single Number.
\$1.00 per year, post paid.

1890.

A MONTHLY
REVIEW

THE BYSTANDER

OF

CURRENT EVENTS,
CANADIAN AND GENERAL.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
The Political Situation.	105
Mr. Meredith and the Contest in Ontario.	107
The Stanstead Election.	109
Roman Catholicism versus Jesuitism.	110
Manitoba and the North-West.	111
The Growth of Toronto.	113
The Toronto Anglican Jubilee.	114
The Enfranchisement of Women.	116
The President's Message and Reciprocity.	118
Death of Jefferson Davis.	119
English Investments in the United States.	122
The Cronin Verdict.	123
The Brazilian Revolution	123
English Politics.	124
Choosing a Leader.	127
Lord Rosebery on Imperial Federation.	128
The European War-Cloud.	128
Labour Disturbances.	129
Scandals in England.	131
Canadian Art.	132
Anglo-Israel	134
Canadian Literature.	136

Toronto:

HUNTER, ROSE & COMPANY, 25 WELLINGTON ST.

PUBLISHERS.

WHOLESALE AGENTS:

TORONTO NEWS CO., TORONTO.

Digitized by Google
MONTREAL NEWS CO., MONTREAL.

MACMILLAN & CO.'S NEW ILLUSTRATED BOOKS NOW READY.

JOSEPH PENNELL'S NEW BOOK—CHOICELY ILLUSTRATED.

PEN DRAWING AND DRAUGHTSMEN: THEIR WORK AND THEIR METHODS. A Study of the Art of To-day, with Technical Remarks. By Joseph Pennell. With Photogravures and other illustrations. 4to, \$30.

*A special edition has been printed, of twenty-five copies only, each containing an original pen drawing by the author, no two copies being alike. Price, \$50.

WESTMINSTER ABBEY. By the Rev. W. J. Lottie, author of "Windsor Castle," etc. With 12 full-page plates and many illustrations, chiefly by Herbert Ralston. Imperial 4to, cloth, gilt, \$7.50.

THE EARLIER ENGLISH WATER-COLOR PAINTERS. By Cosmo Monkhouse. With 18 plates after Turner, Girtin, Bonington, Cotman, De Wint, Sandby, Hearne, Barret, Prout, Cosens, Copley, Fielding, Cattmole, and David Cox. Super royal 4to, cloth, \$7.50.

STOTT LIBRARY—NEW VOLUME.

LAMB'S ESSAYS OF ELIA. With illustrations by Walter Collett. 2 volumes, 32mo, the set, \$1.50.

THE STUDENT'S GIBBERO. Adapted from the German of Dr Munk's "Geschichte der Romisten," by the Rev. W. Y. Faussett, M.A. With a Frontispiece Portrait. 16mo, cloth, red edges, \$1.

WALTER PATER'S NEW BOOK.

APPROPRIATIONS. With an Essay on Style. By Walter Pater, Fellow of Brasenose College. Globe 8vo, \$1.75.

FRANCIS T. PALGRAVE'S NEW WORK.

THE TREASURY OF SACRED SONG. Selected from the English Lyrical Poetry of Four Centuries. With Notes Explanatory and Biographical. By Francis T. Palgrave, editor of "The Golden Treasury of Songs and Lyrics." Limited edition, choicely printed on hand-made paper. small 4to, half vellum, uncut edges, \$7.

*Small paper edition now ready, price \$2.

A HISTORY OF THE LATER ROMAN EMPIRE, FROM ARCADIVUS TO IRENE, A.D. 395-900. By John B. Bury, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin. 2 vols, 8vo, \$8.

PROF. EDWARD CAIRD'S NEW BOOK.

THE CRITICAL PHILOSOPHY OF IMMANUEL KANT. By Edward Caird, LL.D., Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Glasgow. 2 vols, 8vo, \$7.50.

The object of this book is to give a connected view of the Critical Philosophy, showing the relations of the three Critiques to each other, and to the other works of Kant, which may be regarded as illustrations or developments of his main argument. The first part on the Critique of Pure Reason deals with the same subject as my former work entitled "The Philosophy of Kant," but, except in a few passages, it is not a reproduction of it.—From the Preface.

INDIVIDUALISM: A System of Politics. By Wordsworth Donisthorpe, Barrister at Law, author of "Principles of Plutology," etc. 8vo, \$4.

MRS. MOLESWORTH'S NEW BOOK FOR CHILDREN.

THE RECTORY CHILDREN. By Mrs. Molesworth. With illustrations by Walter Crane. 16mo, \$1.25.

A NEW BOOK OF COLORED PICTURES, WITH MUSIC.

FLOWERS OF PARADISE. MUSIC—VERSE—DESIGN—ILLUSTRATION. By Reginald F. Hallward. Printed in colors by Edmund Evans. Royal 4to, \$2.

TWELVE ENGLISH STATESMEN SERIES.

New volume. 12mo, cloth, limp, 60 cents; edges uncut, 75 cents.

WALPOLE. By John Morley.

The book is one which none who take it up will willingly put down. In style it is perhaps the best of Mr. Morley's writings.—Daily News.

Mr. Morley's long-expected Life of Sir Robert Walpole has at length made its appearance, and deserves to be read, not only as the work of one of the most prominent politicians of the day, but for its intrinsic merits. It is a clever, thoughtful, and interesting biography.—St. James's Gazette.

RECENTLY PUBLISHED:

WILLIAM THE CONQUEROR. By Edward A. Freeman.

HENRY THE SECOND. By Mrs. J. R. Green.

WOLSEY. By Prof. M. Creighton.

OLIVER CROMWELL. By Frederic Harrison.

WILLIAM THE THIRD. By H. D. Traill.

HENRY THE SEVENTH. By James Gardner.

THE ENGLISH ILLUSTRATED MAGAZINE. CHRISTMAS DOUBLE NUMBER.

PRICE, 30 CENTS.

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION, \$1.75.

*The Christmas Double Number of the English Illustrated Magazine contains nearly 140 pages, with upward of 80 illustrations. Send 30 cents for sample copy to the publishers.

CONTENTS:

ALL HANDS TO THE PUMP.

FROM MOOR TO SEA.

FRENCH GIRLHOOD.

OH, DEAR! WHAT CAN THE MATTER BE.

A MODERN PROBLEM.

YULETIDE.

POACHERS FURRED AND FEATHERED.

AT THE CLOSE OF A YEAR.

THE GOLDEN DACHSHUNDS.

A STORIED TAVERN.

CHURCH SUNDAY SCHOOLS.

THE LABORS OF THE TWELVE MONTHS.

SNOW.

IN THE PELOPONNESUS.

CYCLE OF SIX LOVE LYRICS.

NAILS AND CHAINS.

THE CATS OF ANCIENT EGYPT.

LA MULETTE, ETC.

Macmillan & Co.'s New Illustrated Holiday Catalogue will be sent free, by mail, to any address on application.

MACMILLAN & CO., 112 4th Avenue, New York.

THE BYSTANDER.

JANUARY, 1890.

A MIDST the tangled confusion into which the Jesuits' Estates affair has thrown the parties and their relations, the broad lineaments of the situation are clear enough. To avert the separate growth of a French nationality, with its certain consequences, Lord Durham conceived the design of fusing the British and French Provinces by means of a legislative union into a nation, in which he no doubt hoped that the British element would prove the stronger and prevail. Full effect, however, was not given to this policy, since the representation was not fused but was left on a quasi-federal basis, each Province, irrespective of its population, sending an equal and separate delegation to the United Parliament; a concession which though under the circumstances it may have been inevitable was pregnant with danger to the scheme. What might have happened if real power had remained in the strong and impartial hands of a Royal Governor we cannot possibly say; but in the hands of party politicians fain to seek the French and clerical alliance the fate of the scheme was settled from the beginning. Government under that ill-starred wedlock became impracticable and a divorce inevitably followed. The next attempt was a nation with a federal structure, the Constitution being modelled on that of the United States, though with a false front of monarchy, which, so far as the practical operations of our institutions is concerned, is mere lumber and waste of money. To make up a federa-

tion, the other British colonies were taken in, though, as their distance and the absence of commercial connection prevented their effectual incorporation, their nominal inclusion has but little modified the question between Ontario and Quebec. The keystone of the new edifice was the national control over Provincial action embodied in the Veto, that "vast power," that "palladium," to cite once more the words of Sir Alexander Galt, which could alone control the divergent and separatist tendencies of the French colony. But this power upon the very first signal occasion for its exercise the two political parties have combined to surrender at the bidding of Quebec, who is thus declared at liberty to pursue her anti-national tendencies without control. So, virtually, ends the experiment of a nation with a federal structure. The existing arrangement may be mechanically prolonged by Machine management and by the payment of bribes to Quebec out of the Federal chest, in other words, out of the purse of Ontario. The Equal Rights movement has evidently had the effect of scaring all those in Quebec who are not Nationalists and making them do their best to put on the drag; and the consummation may thus be further postponed. But the keystone is out of the political arch; the hope of welding the British and French elements into one body with one soul is, to all appearance, at an end. Mr. Longley, it seems, derides the possibility of a separate French nation. What he derides as a possibility is almost a fact. Difference of race, of language, of religion, with a distinct political character and ideal, and a territorial boundary line almost constitute a nation. The fundamental institutions of Quebec even are different from ours, since while we are a democracy she is under priestly rule. The connection in such circumstances becomes little more than a league. A war in Europe, if the mother countries of British and French Canada were opposed to each other, would tear away the last rag of disguise. The credit is claimed for Sir John Macdonald of having been the chief author of Confederation; but he must

also bear the responsibility of having, in founding his Government on French support, raised the French power to its present height. However, the surrender has been complete on both sides.

If the Ottawa Government is not the organ of national supremacy and control, what is it? What does it do to justify its enormous expense, the mountain of public debt which it is piling up; and the vast development of corruption of which unhappily it is the cause? External security and internal peace with freedom of intercourse, which it is the regular function of a federal government to give, were given us already by the Empire of which all these colonies are members, and under which they were in fact federated to all intents and purposes before Canadian federation. Suppose Ontario kept her best public men in her own legislature, instead of sending them to Ottawa, why should she not be competent to make her own laws, criminal as well as civil, appoint her own judges, regulate the marriage law for herself, raise and officer her own militia, issue her own currency? To settle the tariff nothing would be needed but a zollverein, while such matters as navigation, postal rates and railway gauges might be settled by convention. This is the question which Ontario will presently begin to ask herself if Quebec is not to be a partner in the effort to found a united nation, but a load to be carried; still more if Quebec is to reign over us and make us tributary to her by force of an alien vote. As to Manitoba and the North-West, liberation from their thralldom to Ottawa and its confederates would be to them the opening of a more prosperous era.

In any case Ontario has interests of her own which she cannot afford to sacrifice. The Roman Catholic and Archiepiscopal organ at Kingston is quoted by Mr. Meredith as saying, "Holding, as we do, the balance of power between the two great factions we have but to be independent and we can dictate the terms upon which one or the other shall receive our support." This is explicit, and it is in this way, we may hope,

that Ontario has made up her mind not to be governed. We demur to the rule of an ecclesiastical Tammany even when it is allied to a "Liberal" Party. A square issue was tendered by Mr. Mowat, and still more by the organs of his party, which did not, any more than did Mr. David Mills, measure their language in speaking of the friends of Equal Right. It has been pretty squarely taken by Mr. Meredith, who now for the first time has a chance of at least making a good fight in the impending battle. Mr. Mowat occupies in the Province a position something like that of Sir John Macdonald in the Dominion : he has long been in possession of power, has filled the Province with his appointees, has redistributed the representation at his pleasure, and has all the means of influence in his hands. The Catholic vote he is allowed to use, turn about with Sir John, by an arrangement very convenient to both of them, though rather perplexing to their respective organists. A Ministry thus entrenched and wielding the patronage is not to be overturned by any minor charges of misgovernment, such as tampering with licenses or jobbery about registrarships. It can be overturned only by the leverage of a great question appealing strongly to the interest or sentiment of the people. Let Ottawa now leave Mr. Meredith's hands free and there will be a prospect at least of an effective Opposition, without which, everybody will admit, party government is of all forms of government the worst. Mr. Meredith, we are glad to see, firmly marked the distinction between repression of ecclesiastical encroachment and doing any sort of wrong or showing any antipathy to Roman Catholics. To deprive our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens of equal right, in any respect or in any degree, is what has neither been proposed nor desired by any human being.

The complete separation of the spiritual from the temporal and the perfect equality of all religions before the law are organic principles of civilization in the New World, which have been approved by experience as well as by conscience in their application both to Church and State. They condemn Separate

Schools, the collection of tithe in Quebec, and all ecclesiastical domination in politics. They will make their way as certainly as the light of morning. Even the French peasant will in time be enlightened by the transmission of ideas to him from his compatriots who have settled in the United States and will grow tired, as all the Catholic nations in Europe have grown tired, of being eaten up by ecclesiastical imposts and exactions. Old politicians may think that they can shuffle off the issue for their time. But young politicians will find that, to say nothing of principle, they have made a grand mistake in lending themselves to that which is sure in the end to prove the losing side. Rational and manly allegiance to party is compatible with a firm refusal to be put in a wrong position on the leading question of the future.

—In estimating the electoral results of Equal Rights or any other independent movement we must bear in mind the tremendous power of the Machines. Wonderful would be the political thralldom to which they have reduced the people if we did not know that free institutions will not make free natures, and small is the number of those who are by nature free. Most of us crave for a sheepfold and a shibboleth. The people will vote not only against a principle, such as Equal Rights, but what is stranger still, against their material and well-known interests rather than brave the ban of Party. Virtually the Machines coalesce against anything which is independent and spoils the game, as principle is always apt to do. They have evidently coalesced on the present occasion. Every one who gives an independent vote therefore indicates the convictions of a score. In Stanstead, Mr. Colby, at all events, had to come down from his pinnacle of disdain and to condescend to fight for his seat. He took the line that if a Provincial Act is *intra vires* it cannot, however bad, be constitutionally vetoed, having himself the other day voted for vetoing a Manitoba Act chartering a local railway, the legality of which was undoubted and had

been expressly admitted by his chief. He grants that the Equal Rights movement is one of principle, but says that it is not one of worldly wisdom ; but then his notions of worldly wisdom appear to include a use of the Speaker's chair for a partisan purpose, which is worldly with a vengeance if not so manifestly wise. In Stanstead a protest was all that could be hoped, and a manly protest breaks the spell of Machine servitude.

—A strong article in *Le Canada* against the Jesuits shows that the restless and intriguing Order is only a degree less hateful to the quiet people in its own Church than it is to the special objects of its hostile machinations. To understand this case, we must always bear in mind the difference between the Latin Church of the dark ages with its natural superstitions and the Ultramontane reaction set on foot when the day had dawned to prevent the spread of light. It is of the reaction that the brotherhood of Loyola is the embodiment and organ. The contrast was seen when Jesuit emissaries were plotting against the throne and life of Elizabeth, while Howard, an old Catholic, commanded the fleet against the Armada. It is seen when we compare the poetry of genuine piety and romance, embodied in the medieval cathedral, with the meretricious ornaments of the Jesuit Church and its air loaded with sensuous clouds of incense. It is seen when we compare the crafty casuistry and florid oratory of the Jesuit with the religious literature of the Middle Ages. The old Latin Church was practically consistent with nationality and patriotism. Ultramontanism is an anti-national conspiracy. Nobody doubts the perfect sincerity of Anselm, of St. Louis, or even of Becket, though in Becket we see strongly developed that ecclesiastical ambition which was at work, together with less sinister influences, in building up the edifice of medieval superstition ; but charity itself can hardly believe that men who inherit our common nature can pass their lives in plotting, intriguing and casuistically tampering with moral-

ity, without feeling at all events an occasional suspicion that they are not serving truth. The triumph of anti-national Ultramontaniam over the national Catholicism followed naturally when the national governments threw off their vassalage to the Pope, and the Vatican thus became the sole centre of reaction. Yet the ancient faith was still lingering among the old Catholic families of England, at the time of the "Papal Aggression," when the Duke of Norfolk from offended patriotism became a Protestant. It lingered till yesterday in French Canada, which had been isolated from the general movement by British conquest and subsequently by the French Revolution. In the Sulpician Seminary of Montreal, the old Catholicism had a fortress which it cost the Jesuit engineer the utmost efforts of his craft to reduce. That fortress however has now fallen.

—Whether Mr. Martin's bold plan of uniting Manitoba with the adjacent territory can be carried into effect we must leave it to the inhabitants to decide. But he cannot do better than combine the people of the whole of the North-West for the maintenance of their common and distinct interests. Those interests have been sacrificed to the objects of a party government at Ottawa, which wants to make everything politically subservient to itself, and of a group of Montreal capitalists, which wants to make everything commercially tributary to Montreal. The people have themselves been accomplices in their own undoing by allowing themselves to be seduced by petty government bribes into sending untrustworthy representatives to Ottawa, though the difficulty of finding men at once of character and of leisure in a new settlement may be pleaded as an excuse for the mistake. The result has been what everyone who chooses to speak the truth must pronounce, considering the vast capacities of the country, comparative failure. The country has not only been kept back but discredited, and instead of the elements of a vigor-

ous, high-spirited and thriving community has been receiving heterogeneous scraps of population till at last it is in danger of being turned into a second Utah; the Ottawa Government, probably caring not much how the region is peopled so long as it is not by "a gang" which will assert its political independence. With fair-play that fruitful expanse can hardly fail to prosper, the rigour of its winter notwithstanding; but it has not yet had anything like fair-play. About its first chance of fair-play is that which is given it by the patriotic attitude of the Greenway Government.

The C. P. R., that great national enterprise to which because it was national, exclusively and superlatively national, the Dominion has given over a hundred millions in subsidies of different kinds, and in which no Yankee was even to hold stock, has now not only become thoroughly identified with the American railway system, but, as the *Toronto Mail* has proved, discriminates against Canadian trade. This surely is a fact from which commercial separatists, if they are not blind, will draw a moral. The operation of the national road with regard to immigration is much the same as it is with regard to trade. It is all the time carrying immigrants down the line away from Manitoba and our settlements to Washington, Oregon and Montana. In an emigrant train going west there were found 7 passengers for Vancouver, 3 for Victoria, 21 for Tacoma, and 37 for Seattle. The *Canada Gazette*, by the way, will find on referring again to the BYSTANDER of former years that it was of the Intercolonial, not the C. P. R., that we spoke when we said that it would probably be ruined by the short cut through Maine. It is the C. P. R. itself that makes the short cut. In subsidizing the short cut the Dominion Parliament has in fact declared that the BYSTANDER's prophecy with regard to the ultimate abandonment of the Intercolonial has proved true. He predicted that commercially the section north of Lake Superior would be a failure, and to that prediction he adheres. Nothing at least can falsify it, as he thinks and as is thought by

much better authorities than he is, except an extraordinary development of mining in the region, which again is impossible without a market.

—The gourd-like growth of Toronto is due, we apprehend, not so much to manufactures as to the passion for city life which all over the world is leading the people to throng into the great cities and has swelled London into a huge tumour on the social frame. In the production of this tendency popular education, by creating a distaste for manual labour, has probably played a part, but a greater part has been played by the railways, of which Toronto has recently become a centre, and which bring in the people first to make purchases or see sights and ultimately to settle. If those who have money come in those who have not money must follow to get employment, while a good many moths are lured by the brightness of the candle. Speaking generally, the tendency has its evils. The people cannot afford to be so well housed in the city as they are in a village; they breathe less pure air, their children grow up in surroundings less healthy for body and mind, and though they have more of crowd and excitement they have really less of social life; for while in the village they all know each other, in the city they do not know their next-door neighbour.

The alarm has been raised that manufactures are beginning to fly from city taxes. This seems as yet to be only in a single case. Yet city taxes must be a heavy deduction from profits made here. In Toronto we all pay for our own roads, sidewalks, drains and water. We shovel our own snow and care for our own boulevards. The relief of the poor is left to private charity and there is not even a city officer for its superintendence. A city government could hardly do less for the inhabitants. What then, people ask, becomes of the great sums raised in taxes? Peculation, nobody we believe, suspects. Jobbery can hardly be altogether avoided when a corps of contractors is brought into contact with a body elected as the Council is

But the chief leakage, we take it, arises from the waste which is inseparable from an unskilled administration, and one which being elected every year is too short-lived to exercise foresight and act on system. The heaviest charge, apart from the interest on the debt, is the school tax, on which we suspect, in spite of all our sentiment, it will some day be found necessary to put a curb. The only justification for making one man pay for the education of another man's children, which he is no more by nature bound to do than he is to feed and clothe them, is that in a democracy ignorance is a political danger. It seems however from what Mrs. Ashley says and from what the Minister of Education said some time ago that the dangerous class, or a large portion of it, is allowed to escape attendance at the schools. If the truancy law is not enforced the school tax becomes simply a heavy impost levied by one section of the community for its own behoof and without warrant on the others. In order to make the system consistent either with social justice or with the soundness of city finance, the teaching must be kept strictly elementary, and the truancy law must be enforced. To enforce the truancy law in a community such as ours is difficult, no doubt, but to shrink from enforcing it is to condemn the system.

—At the very successful Jubilee of the Anglican Diocese of Toronto the key-note of the speeches generally was comprehensiveness. Comprehensiveness, which is dear to cultivated and liberal minds, combined with hierarchical and historical dignity, has been a strong point in the Church of England. But how far can it be carried? The tendency of Ritualism, it is hardly possible to doubt, is to the restoration of the Mass, the very phraseology of which, and all the ritual, saving the bells and incense, have been introduced. Now a man who does not like Ritualism will, if he is liberal and sensible, put up with a great deal of it, because he feels that Ritual in itself is not doctrine, and that what is unedifying to him may be edifying to others. But the Mass is either a miracle or an im-

posture ; and how can a man assist at what he believes to be a false miracle ? To a certain extent the difficulty arising from the vital difference between High Church and Low Church settles itself for the present by a division of congregations, but this also must have its limit.

The subject of preaching came-up. People know, of course, yet they do not make practical allowance for the fact that preaching is a gift, and that you can no more expect your pastor to preach like the Bishop of Huron, the Bishop of Algoma, or the Bishop of Nova Scotia than you can expect him to write like Mr. Farrer or to paint like Mr. O'Brien. The wonder is not that ordinary sermons are no better but that they are as good as they are ; for we take it there are few literary men who if they were called upon for two essays a week on the same class of subjects would not soon throw down their pens in despair. A clergyman, instead of having leisure for composition, has his time filled with visiting, and, in addition to this, by the ever-increasing throng of religious side-shows of every kind. Our people must remember, too, that pulpit oratory, like other rare articles, must be paid for, and that Canadian stipends are not as high as those of New York. When preaching the Word meant nothing but imparting saving truth to people who were ignorant of it, no oratorical power was required. But now congregations demand pulpit oratory, and grow restless if the preaching is dull or unvaried, whence arise no little trouble and scandal. A corps of itinerant preachers naturally suggests itself ; but to this, besides the expense, which would be considerable, is opposed the deep division of opinion, to which reference has already been made. It would almost be necessary to have two sets, one for High Church the other for Low Church congregations. A few there are, perhaps, who care a great deal more for the service than for the preaching, and who will be satisfied if their pastor cultivates the brevity which is the one kind of excellence within the reach of the humblest composer. But the vast majority crave for fine preaching, and how their craving is to be satisfied it is

hard to say, unless they will let their pastor read published sermons, a plan to which we see no objection, and which would give us all a corps of select preachers indeed.

Among the names to be commemorated first and foremost, of course, was that of Bishop Strachan, a martial eulogy on whom drew from the Bishop of Western New York the good-humoured reply that he should go home and tell his fellow-countrymen that the man who had really driven them off the hillside at Queenston Heights was Bishop Strachan. The robust and strenuous representative of the Apostles on one occasion allowed himself to be driven off his own position when he had much better have held it. His Church had lost her exclusive possession of Toronto University; still she had possession, she had prestige, she had the support of the most influential, the best educated, the most academical class. Secession is of all policies the weakest. The best is to stick to the ship. Bishop Strachan ought to have stuck to the ship instead of giving it up to his opponents and getting off into a boat, of which, lavish what able effort, what munificence, what affection you will upon it, a ship can never be made. An Anglican College in the free University, at all events, would have given him all the security that he could reasonably desire without the impotence and the mental evils of seclusion.

—One day comes Mr. George and proposes to regenerate society by turning over all our real estate to the politicians; the next comes Miss Susan B. Anthony and proposes to regenerate society by turning over the government to the ladies. Miss Anthony says that the want of the ballot entails not only political but moral and social degradation. The answer seems to be that in the country from which she comes the women, though they have not the ballot, instead of being morally and socially degraded, are in the enjoyment of privileges some of which are rather oppressive to the men. Miss Anthony assumes that women are an unenfranchised class.

They are not a class but a sex, with the interest of which those of the other sex are by their conjugal and family ties completely bound up, so that in legislating for their wives, daughters and sisters the men are legislating for themselves. The reason why the men have made and must make the law is that they alone can enforce it: laws made by women could have no force behind them and would therefore fail. The liberties of which restitution is claimed, as though the men had robbed the women of them, have really been wrought out by the men, and the number of men who have perished in extorting them from despots bears a considerable proportion to the number of those by whom they have as yet been enjoyed. Miss Anthony mentions no legislative grievance which male legislators are unable to redress, or of which they have refused redress to their wives, daughters and sisters. She complains generally that women are half-paid. They are not half-paid in their own callings, such as those of the singer or the *modiste*; and if they make less money in other callings it is generally because they have less muscle and less brain power than the man, or because they are not so devoted to the vocations, few of them absolutely renouncing marriage. Those who agitate for female suffrage seldom say much about the interests of the family which has hitherto been a unit before the State, and the harmony of which could hardly fail to be imperilled by the introduction of political division; for whatever fine pictures may be drawn few can really believe that conjugal love would not be affected by the appearance of man and wife on opposite sides in a bitter party conflict. Of want of facility of divorce American women can now hardly complain, nor can they say with Mill that a woman is worse off than a slave since she cannot change her master. Miss Anthony seems to admit that the movement is not general among her sex, and the fact seems to be that it is largely kept on foot by the craving of a few ladies for the excitement of public life. In England, the other day, one hundred and four women of the highest distinction, seeing that the real interests of the whole

sex were in danger of being sacrificed to the fancy of a few, appealed to "the common-sense and educated thought of the men and women of England against the proposed extension of the Parliamentary suffrage to women." The movement has now been going on in the United States for forty years during which time almost all the States have dealt either in the way of construction or revision with their civil codes, and not one of them has given the political franchise to women. In the Territory of Wyoming the experiment has been made, the object being probably to attract women where they were scarce, and in face of the results of that experiment four new States the other day in drafting their Constitutions deliberately confined the political franchise to males. In Washington the question was put to the people and the result was a great majority against the innovation. The Americans have a great safeguard in the submission of constitutional amendments to the people, who cannot be wheedled or frightened like individual legislators. Here the ladies have only to wheedle or frighten a party leader in order to bring about a sexual revolution.

—That President Harrison should not have mentioned Commercial Union in his message is no proof that Commercial Union is dead. It was not likely that a new President the first time he opened his mouth to a Congress hardly settled in its place would propose Commercial Union, especially as a committee on relations with Canada was still sitting. When Congress gets fairly upon the tariff question, and not till then, we shall know the policy of the Republican party and the President. So say our own informants. Revenue must be reduced, and in view of that necessity no policy apparently ought to be more welcome to the Republican party than one which reduces revenue and extends trade at the same time without touching the principle of Protection. That there is in the Republican party a section disposed to unfriendly

courses towards Great Britain, and towards Canada as her dependency, cannot be denied, and it is very likely that Mr. Hoar is a member of it: he has at least given strong indications of anti-British feeling. But we know not why his word should be invested with so much authority or why it should be assumed that his section would prevail. Meantime there can be little doubt that Free Trade is gaining ground. People begin to say that Mr. Cleveland stands a fair chance of re-election. If we are satisfied that we are right in desiring for Canada the markets of her own continent, we must be patient and hopeful, not despair of the cause because by some turn in the battle of political parties its progress is checked for a time or because opponents shout that it is dead.

Truly does the *Sherbrooke Gazette* say that the chief sufferer by protection is the farmer. If a decline of twenty-two and a-half millions in the value of farm property in Ontario since 1883 does not condemn the system, so far as the owners of that kind of property are concerned, we should like to know what would. The same cry comes from all parts of the rural districts and from the towns which depend on them for their trade. The wages of agricultural labourers have also fallen. The farmers of Ontario, at any rate, and all whom their depression affects, are ripe for a change of system. They would heartily respond if the Opposition would move a resolution declaring that the fiscal policy of the Government, so far as they were concerned, had failed. Not less hearty would be the response from Manitoba and the North-West. The Opposition will throw away its chances if it does not, either by way of amendment to the Address, which is the best and most effective course, or in some form during the course of the session, move vigorously in this direction.

—Jefferson Davis was not a great man but his death closes an era. He was called a monument of American clemency. It is true the Americans showed infinitely more humanity

and wisdom after their second civil war than they did after their first, when they hanged or despoiled and drove into exile by Acts of Attainder Loyalists guilty of nothing but defending a cause which they had a perfect right to defend, the Revolutionists themselves being witnesses; for even Samuel Adams and the Boston agitators disclaimed, though insincerely, any intention of severing the connection with the mother country. But it would have been murder to hang Jefferson Davis or any other Confederate as a rebel. Champions of an evil cause the men who fought for slavery were. Rebels, in any rational sense of that term, they were not. Secession was not rebellion. Two groups of States, radically differing from each other in social structure and therefore in political tendencies and requirements, had been held together in an uneasy union, which Northern morality denounced as a compact with hell. At last, naturally and inevitably, they fell asunder. The Southern group became *de facto* a nation. It had a regular government, with executive, legislative and judiciary, perfectly recognized and obeyed throughout the whole of a large and well-defined territory. It commanded not only the allegiance, but the devotion of its free citizens, who poured out their blood for it like water through a long war of independence. Even among the slaves there was no revolt and hardly a symptom of disaffection, though as the war went on many of them were swept into the Federal lines. If affirmations of the principle that people have a right to change their government were needed they might have been found by cartloads in the speeches of Northern orators and the writings of Northern publicists. The North, being far the larger and more powerful nation, proceeded to conquer and re-annex the smaller and weaker nation. In doing this it did only what the strong have always been doing from the days of Sennacherib downwards; but conquest for the purpose of self-aggrandizement, however familiar, can claim no sympathy. The only ground which the North had for claiming sympathy and complaining of its absence, was that the South was a slave power,

founded for the propagation of an accursed institution and that in taking arms against it the Federals were executing the ban of humanity. But that ground the North through its legislature positively disclaimed, offering the South if it would return to the Union not only the retention of slavery but further guarantees. John Corwin's Resolution in favour of a Constitutional Amendment, declaring the institution of slavery inviolable and unalterable, had received the requisite two-thirds majority of both Houses of Congress when parley was ended by the opening of the cannon on Fort Sumter. After this with what face could the people of the United States upbraid England with not regarding the war as a crusade against slavery? The great mass of the English people, discerning the practical issue, notwithstanding the ignominious disclaimer, and being true to the noble traditions of their own nation, did after all sympathize with the North; and Great Britain steadfastly rejected the proposal of joint intervention which was pressed on her by the French Emperor though acceptance would not only have brought her the cotton, for want of which her countless looms were standing still and her myriads of artisans were on the brink of famine, but would have given her a perpetual claim to the gratitude and support of a powerful community on this side of the Atlantic. It may be doubted whether any nation ever paid a higher tribute to morality than did England in withstanding that temptation. The more candid of the American historians now admit that one motive of their countrymen for making war on Great Britain in 1812 was the hope of sharing with Napoleon the victory which they believed that tyrant was sure to gain over European independence. The Americans had nursed a slave-owning aristocracy, and with that aristocracy European aristocracy sympathized in the struggle. What else in reason could be expected? Could the Americans demand of a foreign nation a unanimity of feeling in favour of the war which was as far as possible from existing among themselves? Among the friends of the slave-owner in the North were the great mass of the Irish, in deference to whose

passions honour was the other day denied to the ashes of John Bright, the grand European champion of the North in the struggle. An Englishman need not fear that when his country stands before the tribunal of history sentence in this cause will go against her. As to the violations of British neutrality by the South, in the case of the *Alabama* and her consorts, what were they in comparison with the violations of American neutrality which had been permitted to the French at the opening of the war between France and England? Americans of the better class are ready to hear reason on these points, but in the Press and among the masses the Anglophobic version still prevails, and a common audience receives with incredulous surprise the assurance that the *Alabama* was not armed in a British port with the cognizance of the British Government and manned out of the British naval reserve. A democracy, when its self-love and self-will have been flattered by generations of demagogues, is as incapable of doing justice to those who have affronted its majesty as the most besotted of despots.

—Nothing in the commercial world is more striking than the immense flow of British capital into the United States. It shows in the first place that England has not been ruined by Free Trade, and in the second place that the English do not regard the United States as “a hostile nation” or give the colonies a commercial preference over it. Whatever may be said as to trade, investment does not closely follow the flag. Possibly the investors may also be feeling, in some degree, decreased confidence in the stability of British as compared with American institutions. The *New York Times* states that a hundred millions of British capital are about to be invested in a single enterprise. From another source we learn that since July of last year eighteen American brewery companies have been bought out in the London market. Canadian experience shows that the British investor is apt to be at once singularly

rash and singularly timid, and both in the wrong place: he will refuse the soundest stock and rush into the most speculative enterprise. Let him remember that American sharp-practice, though it has been much exaggerated, is not altogether fabulous, that the United States are a foreign though not a hostile country, and that Anglophobia does sometimes affect the strictness both of commercial dealing and of legal justice.

—The escape of the Cronin murderers from the halter, which, if they were guilty at all, was manifestly their due, is a partial failure of justice. The Americans, however, have seen what the Clan-na-Gael is like, and what it is they have been flattering and fostering all these years. No man deserves to stand in the dock of public opinion better than he who, when President Elect, to pander to Irish passion, signed an address excusing Irish outrage, or the highly moral Senator from New England, who, with the same noble object, palliated the Phoenix Park murderers.

—The Brazilian Revolution was more of a revolution than at first appeared. As to the cause we were not misled. The Emancipation of the Slaves may have disgusted the great landowners and deprived the Crown of their support at the critical moment: but it was not the emancipation of the slaves that caused the revolution. The main cause of the revolution, as the advices indicate, and as the London *Times* thinks, was one of which we heard long ago. It was fear of the reactionary tendencies of the heiress to the Crown who was in the hands of the Jesuits. The first thing this lady does on setting foot in Europe is to make a pilgrimage to Lourdes, and the friends of the dynasty, aware of her weakness, propose to pass her over in their choice of a pretender and adopt the Emperor's grandson, a boy of fourteen. Jesuitism has

scored another James II. This is Sir John Thompson's harmless "company of Christian teachers and preachers." If a civil war breaks out, the public money of a Canadian Province may be used to shed Brazilian blood in the interest of Ultramontane reaction. Amidst all our speculations about the political bearings of the Jesuit case we think too little of the plain question of duty. What right has Canada to aid a deadly conspiracy against liberty, progress, and truth ?

We are told that we need not trouble ourselves about the Jesuit ; he always fails. So he does. He failed in Germany after destroying by the Thirty Years' War more than half the population. He failed in France after kindling the War of the League and nearly handing over the country to Philip II. He failed in France again after extirpating the Protestants and sowing the seeds of the Revolution. He failed in the Netherlands after the religious murder of multitudes and half-a-century of bloodshed. He failed in England after nearly wrecking the liberties of the people by the hand of James II. and bringing on civil war in Scotland and Ireland. He failed in Spain after helping Ferdinand VII. to overturn the Constitution and inaugurate a reign of terror. He failed in Switzerland after arraying the Catholic cantons against the Protestant in the field of civil war. He failed once more in France after drawing her into a ruinous war with Germany. In Brazil he fails after leading a dynasty to ruin and filling the country with strife, which may possibly result in serious bloodshed.

—It seems as if the junction of the Liberal Unionists with the Conservatives in England, long delayed by Lord Hartington and his friends, in the vain hope that when Home Rule was out of the way they might again lead a Liberal party of the old stamp, is at last about to take place. Home Rule is out of the way, at least for the present ; but in its place appears socialistic revolution, to save the country from which and from dismemberment at the same time all the anti-revolutionary

forces must be combined. Hoodwinked to a strange extent by the survival of monarchical and aristocratic forms which had lost all their force and ceased to afford any real safeguards, British statesmen have gone on extending the franchise without providing any checks or strengthening the upper works of the Constitution till they have slipped, without being aware of it, into the most unbridled democracy. Universal suffrage is more perilous in England than it is in France, where the masses are small landowners and Conservative in their way, while in England they are mere wage-earners with a very large proportion of factory hands, the least stable and the most dangerous of all political elements. Power having, it may be said, finally departed from the House of Lords, the only practical safeguards left are the seven years' term for Parliament and non-payment of members. The first preserves to the Legislature a certain degree of independence; the second keeps the representation generally in the hands of men of property. But both these are marked for abolition in the Radical programme drawn up the other day at Manchester under the auspices of Mr. Gladstone, and, should the Radicals win the next election, will certainly fall, together with any remnants of restriction or qualification which limit the sway of universal suffrage. The country will then be launched on the current of revolution, made still more impetuous, if this strife between employer and employed goes on, by the prevalence of industrial war; and where it will bring up, who can say? Feeble leaders, like Lord Rosebery and Mr. Morley, will be utterly incapable of controlling the more violent section of their party even if they were conscientious enough to risk their popularity by the attempt. The disturbance would probably extend to the dependencies. It would hardly be possible that the Indian Empire should survive a reign of revolutionary demagogism in the Imperial country. Its rulers have already begun, we believe, to feel an increase of their perils from that quarter.

That which is worshipped as the British Constitution in reality never was much more than a balance of power between

the Crown, the aristocracy, and the Commons. The balance has oscillated from time to time, inclining under the Tudors to the Crown, under the early Hanoverians to the aristocracy, who then nominated a large portion of the popular House, and of late to the Commons. Power has now completely and finally centred in the House of Commons, which has thus become the government of the country, the executive being a committee of its dominant party. But the House of Commons never was intended to be a government: it was intended only to be the representation of the people for the purpose of granting taxes and conferring with the Crown in which the Government was supposed to reside. Nor is it in any way fitted for its new function. It is a mob elected by a larger mob, which is fast reducing members of Parliament to mere agents by the Caucus. Anyone by attending a few evenings in the gallery may satisfy himself that all power of deliberation and almost the power of preserving order is lost. Unless something can be done, and done speedily, to make the House of Commons fit for the functions of government, there will cease to be a government or any real authority in the country. Lord Salisbury, unhappily, with all his ability, is not the man to grapple with organic problems. He has never given his mind to them. His dominant idea is the preservation of the hereditary House of Lords, to the irretrievable decadence of which he is blind. His only other idea, so far as appears, is female suffrage, by which he imagines that he can cool the revolutionary cauldron. If female suffrage did cool the revolutionary cauldron it would be only for a moment, and at the expense, too probably, of interests more precious if possible than those of the State itself.

The danger of dismemberment for the time is over. Mr. Gladstone refuses to disclose his plan of Home Rule. He has no plan to disclose. The dilemma in which he is placed between the exclusion and retention of the Irish members is fatal. He is also in a dilemma with regard to the order of precedence between Irish and Scottish Home Rule, the Home Rulers of each country demanding that their measure shall be carried

first, because when the Irish depart from Westminster the Scotch, when the Scotch depart the Irish, will be left in a hopeless minority. Precedence is also claimed for Welsh disestablishment by the friends of that measure whose vote is indispensable. Mr. Gladstone, pressed by the different sections of his followers, takes refuge in ambiguous utterance, which begins to lose its effect.

—The Radicals are choosing a leader to succeed Mr. Gladstone. They are embarrassed, but not by their riches. Their choice lies between Sir William Harcourt, Mr. Morley and Lord Rosebery, the weakness of Lord Spencer being now apparently confessed. But Lord Rosebery is in the Upper House; the real leader of the Radical party must be in the Commons. The natural heir is Sir William Harcourt, but of him one of the journals which is booming Mr. Morley, under cover of putting forward Lord Rosebery, says, that it "trusts England will never sink so low as to be governed by him." We can understand the remark, though we doubt whether the cynicism of the coarse opportunist is really more ignoble than the demagogism of the philosophic man of letters who after taking the highest ground as a preacher of morality and of government by intelligence stoops to play the low game of faction, to become the organ of party falsehood, to flatter mob passions, and to delude the ignorant masses with promises which he must know cannot be fulfilled. If the revolution which Mr. Morley invokes really began he and all the other literary and philosophic Jacobins would be crushed like egg shells. About the strongest of the Radicals and the least unfit to govern, strange as it may seem, in reality is Mr. Bradlaugh, who is disqualified by his social heterodoxy. Lord Rosebery is a showy man of talent, whose ambition exceeds his ability, without settled opinions or much force of character. Launched on the revolutionary current, he would drift or sink. Meantime Sir Andrew Clark says that for aught he can

see Mr. Gladstone may live to two hundred. If he does, and continues to advance in his revolutionary line at his present rate he will come to a great pass at last.

The choice of a leader is a serious matter, for the masses to whom the franchise has now been extended, ignorant of all questions and careless of all principles, have nothing to follow but a name. Gladstonian is the proper title of the party; a member of Parliament is elected to vote with Mr. Gladstone, which he must do on all occasions, at the peril of his political life. If he gives a conscientious vote he immediately receives a notice of dismissal from the Caucus. Thus government by the people has, for the time at least, resulted in autocracy.

—The Imperial Federation movement has ended in the proposal by Lord Rosebery of an annual Conference. Not only is a Conference not a Federation, but the proposal seems to imply that the idea of federation is laid aside. However, if the Conference is not to be a mere palaver, it must be invested with some sort of authority, and to be invested with any sort of authority it must be chosen in a regular way, with the consent of the several Colonies, and with an accredited representative from the Mother Country. Of mere oratory and fraternization we have surely had enough.

—Canada may well keep her eyes anxiously fixed on the European war-cloud for two reasons: because a maritime war would suspend her trade with Europe and because a war between Great Britain and France would set the British and French Provinces of the Dominion by the ears. But to attempt to register the daily shiftings of the cloud and the changes in its hue is vain. Lord Salisbury tells us there will be peace; and this is sufficient assurance that there are no immediate signs of war. Lord Salisbury's skill in diplomacy

is beyond question ; but if the remark were not presumptuous, we should say that he was too great a diplomatist : he believes too much in diplomacy as an occult science and overrates its power of controlling violent passions and brute forces. How can he or any man tell what gust of emotion may to-morrow sweep over France, what thoughts may be harboured in the breast of the Czar, or what complications may any day be brought on by some outbreak in Eastern Europe, in Crete, or in Afghanistan ? Assurances of peace may be trusted when armaments are reduced : while they are augmented we must infer that those who augment them look for war. The finances of France appear to be in a bad state. Supposing a crisis comes, will it lead the French to curtail their military expenditure, or will it lead them at once to hurl themselves desperately on Germany ? Who can tell ? In such a case passion would reign and diplomatic science would have little power.

—The contagion of the Dock Strike has spread and British industry seems to be falling into disorganization at the moment when reviving commerce had made the outlook bright. What will be the ultimate consequence, we all know ; it will be the withdrawal of trade from the disturbed centres ; perhaps its departure from England to the continent ; for the men have not yet succeeded in persuading their foreign competitors to forbear taking advantage of their mistakes. The community, let us say again, is the real employer and will give no more for goods or labour than it can afford, so that if the producers or labourers insist on a price higher than the community can afford the trade must cease. There is no help for it, however ; combination is lawful, though it seems hard that those who turn a single wheel in a great machine of industry should be able by striking to make the whole machine stand still, and that a great city should be plunged in darkness whenever the men in the gas works have a quarrel with their employers. Nor are there any means of preventing men from

preferring the calling of a social incendiary to other ways of making their bread. All that the community can do is to protect the rights of non-union men. This it is not only concerned in interest but in duty bound to do. It is not right that any man should be able to say to another unless you will join my combination and submit to the rules which it chooses to make, you shall not work for your bread. There has evidently been a good deal not only of intimidation but of violence in connection with the London strikes. To let club law prevail would be a relapse into barbarism as well as monopoly. This apparently the country begins to feel and two strikes have been resisted and beaten, as it seems, with the general assent of the community.

There can be no shadow of doubt that the material condition of the labouring class in England and other great commercial countries has immensely improved during the last half century, and this without the exercise on their part of the self-denial in regard to marriage which has been exercised by other classes. It is equally certain that the feelings and conduct of the wealthier class towards the labouring class have improved fully as much. Benevolence is multiplying its efforts on all sides, and at this very moment Mr. Guinness is giving a million of dollars for homes for the poor in London and a quarter of a million in Dublin. Yet there never was a time when the feeling of the labouring class, at least of a large portion of it, towards the wealthier class was worse than it is at present or when the industrial air was more full of conspiracy and strife. Raised to a higher level, the mechanics see greater luxuries apparently within their reach. Half educated, they are in that twilight of the mind in which chimeras and charlatanry have power. They have generally ceased to look to a future life for compensation if they get less than their share here, or to believe in the constitution of society as the ordinance of God. There has arisen a set of labour agitators and writers of labour journals who make it their trade to instil venom into the heart of the artisan and to possess him with

the belief that he alone is the "toiler," while all other men are "spoilers" who ought to be made to disgorge, and may deem themselves lucky if they are allowed to escape with their lives. When this industrial embitterment is everywhere going on simultaneously with a political revolution, by which political power is being transferred into the hands of the masses and independent authority is ceasing to exist, who can feel sure that we have not stormy times before us? Fortunately the chiefs of industry and commerce, on whom in this case the brunt of the conflict falls, are not like political demagogues: they are men raised to their leadership by genuine qualities, and they have hitherto met their difficulties and perils with sagacity as well as firmness. As to the possessors of wealth generally, let them instead of roving in search of pleasure stay at their social posts and do their duty. If they do not, trouble will come on them as it has come on every class in history which has been false to its mission. If they do, even supposing they fail to allay the ill-feeling among the working class and to conjure the impending storm, they will get something better than wealth can give and something which the loss of wealth cannot take away. It is a bad part of dependence that wealthy colonists are apt hardly to look upon the colony as their home or their post of duty. They spend half their time in England and look on that as their social spheres.

—If anything can be more revolting than the details of the vice which haunts great and luxurious cities it surely is the appetite which causes those details to be telegraphed all over the world and eagerly devoured. Worse still is the use of them for a political purpose, to which the Radicals in England seem to be joyfully looking forward. To carry on political warfare with ordure is congenial enough to a Parnellite agitator or a member of the Clan-na-Gael; but this filthy savagery has not hitherto polluted British public life. Unfortunately public opinion seems to be debauched enough to license anything so long

as excitement is provided. A Radical journalist is praised by his brethren of the Press for his skill in so collocating two paragraphs as, without risking a direct charge, to convey a deadly imputation against the character of the son of the Prince of Wales. The victim of this cowardly brutality is a stripling whom a manly savage would spare, and who, as he cannot bring a libel suit, is absolutely defenceless. There are crimes which law cannot reach and which public sentiment seems no longer to chastise. Those who have been shocked by foul reports may, we believe, rest assured that the young members of the Royal Family are so closely watched over that their resort to haunts of infamy, even were they so inclined, would be impossible. The Prince of Wales when he was at the university was the subject of slanderous reports which could not possibly have been true, since sight was never lost of him by those who had him under their care.

—Our warmest sympathies are due to those who try to make Toronto a centre of art. But we must not forget the difficulties against which we have to contend. You may count on your fingers, perhaps on the fingers of one hand, the centres of art in the world. They can exist only where there are fine collections to furnish a standard as well as good schools of technical skill, together with great wealth and high culture. It is doubtful whether there is yet one on this continent, though sheer force of money may presently create one at New York. In our case the area is wholly insufficient. We talk of Canada, but the real area is only Ontario and the British quarter of Montreal. We are completely cut off from the Maritime Provinces and from the scanty population of the North-West. For the same reason all efforts to establish a literary periodical have hitherto failed. It is difficult even for a first-class newspaper to maintain itself and meet the high requirements of the present day on so limited a constituency. Yet the local newspaper has not to compete with the products of the world: the local artist has, for the few who buy works

of art are always going to Europe and they buy by preference there. First-rate artists will not stay at any but a great centre. The President of the Canadian Academy himself is drawn away to London: there was nothing of his in the Exhibition at the Canadian Institute. It is even false kindness to encourage a good painter or sculptor to set up his studio where there will be few to appreciate and fewer still to buy. Toronto is not, as some homilies which have been read us on this subject seem to imply, behind other commercial cities of the same size in love of beauty. The marked improvement of her house architecture and the increasing display of objects of taste in her stores acquit her of the charge. But really good painting or sculpture is a tremendously expensive article: it is beyond the means of any but our richest men; and there can be no use in constraining people to buy anything which is not really good. A great deal not only of vulgar embellishment but of genuine beauty in the shape of decoration may be had for the cost of even a tolerable picture or statue. Besides very few even of those who have passed their lives in refined society are sufficiently good judges of art to buy it with confidence, whereas any man may feel sure of getting from a good furniture or decoration store something which is worth his money, and which even if it does not do the highest credit to his taste will not make him a laughing-stock to connoisseurs. The Canadian millionaire when he goes to Europe can buy under good advice as well as with an infinitely greater choice. In portrait painting the local man has an advantage, but even for portraits those who are willing to give a high price will go to Europe, while those who are not will take the photograph touched by the artist's hand. Nobody can pretend that the last Exhibition at the Canadian Institute was successful: it seemed to owe its escape from failure in drawing the public to the bastard attraction of a lottery. Music enjoys a happy exemption from the necessities which chain to certain centres her sister arts, and her progress in Toronto is enough to prove that we are not barbarians.

The counsel will be thought unworthy, we know, by the votaries of high art, but we cannot help thinking that an improvement of the art department of the Industrial Exhibition might be useful as a humble instrument both for the cultivation of popular taste and for the sale, at all events, of such works as please the many. What is exhibited there will be seen by the whole Province, not by Toronto alone, and though the majority will come only to stare some may come to admire and a few to buy. We commend to Mr. Withrow and the other managers the provision of a separate building suitable for the quiet enjoyment of art and a special committee to supervise the admissions. If obtainable, a Loan Collection should always be got together to add to the attractions of native artists and furnish a standard of excellence. Meantime our thanks are due to the organizers of the Exhibition at the Toronto Art Gallery for bringing before our artists and our people such pictures as Dawant's "Embarkment of Emigrants," and Hoeber's "The Daily Bread," and we may add, with special pride in the achievements of an old Toronto artist, G. R. Bridgman's "Boy Overboard."

—Industry is always respectable and no one can deny the praise of industry to Dr. Poole's portly volume on "Anglo-Israel." Every particle of evidence or of anything that looks like evidence in favour of the whimsical hypothesis that the Saxon race is the Lost Tribes of Israel has been collected with the most diligent research by Dr. Poole, whose ethnology in its vigorous sweep draws no distinction between Celt and Teuton, while his philology is subtle enough to deduce "Saxon" from "Isaac." It is impossible to speak of "Anglo-Israel" with disrespect, since it is the creed of the most popular preacher in Toronto, and in England has arrived at the political dignity of being a "vote," and of putting test questions to Parliamentary candidates. It seems to be, in effect, Jingoism with a Biblical sanction. As descendants of the Chosen Race the

Anglo-Saxons inherit the earth. But the doctrine that the Deity bound Himself to advance the interests of a particular race at the expense of the rest if it would pray and sacrifice to Him is a tribal belief and belongs to the theological past. That the Father-of-All has made all nations of one blood to dwell together is the Gospel view, in accordance with which the Apostles went forth to convert the world. Dr. Poole would not like to make religious theory the procuress to unscrupulous ambition. Mazzini had faults and made great mistakes, but he shines among vulgar Chauvinists and Jingoese like a star in virtue of his teaching, amidst all his fervent patriotism, that each nation should regard itself as an organ of humanity. Dr. Poole quotes Dr. Abbadie, of Amsterdam, as saying in 1723, that unless the Ten Tribes have flown into the air or have plunged into the centre of the earth they must be sought for in the North and West and in the British Isles. With deference to the learned shade of Dr. Abbadie, we cannot help thinking that the amalgamation of the Ten Tribes into the other Semites by whom they were surrounded in the land of their captivity is as easy a way out of the difficulty which presented itself to his mind as the transformation of a set of dark, long-nosed and crafty Orientals, into a people of fair-haired, blue-eyed and frank-faced rovers on the Northern Sea.

There is a preface by Dr. Withrow in which is renewed the old indictment against Christendom for the religious persecution of the Jews. We believe that we should have no difficulty in proving to the Doctor that the charge is greatly overstated and Christendom, which has plenty of other grounds for self-reproach, may be comparatively at ease on this. The main cause of the risings of the people against the Jews in the Middle Ages was not difference of religion, though that no doubt embittered the quarrel, but the exactions practised on the people by the Jew. The chief case of a distinctly religious persecution was in Spain, and even there it is difficult to distinguish the religious conflict from that struggle of races, Occidental and Oriental, for the possession of the Pen-

insula, in which the Jew was on the Oriental side. It is the same in modern times; the so-called religious movements against the Jews in Russia, Germany, Austria and the Danubian Principalities are not religious, but are the risings of the people against insufferable usury practised on them by an alien, intruding, and exclusive race. We promise to give Dr. Withrow proof of this whenever he will do us the honour to call for it. Perhaps he will in the meantime consider whether if Christians have been too often intolerant, Jews who will not eat, drink or intermarry with their fellow-citizens are models of toleration.

—British Canada has at all events reason to be proud of her judges and grateful to those who have appointed them for having in the exercise of their momentous trust usually kept the fell demands of party at least within decent limits. Amidst the general decadence of authority and reverence consequent on political strife the people have never ceased to look up with respect and confidence to the Bench; and when a tyrant of the Press, who had trampled with impunity on the characters and feelings of all other people, ventured to assail a judge he was at once made sensible of his error and slunk away in silence. Mr. Read's *Lives of the Judges of Upper Canada* comprises more than thirty sketches of the occupants of the Provincial Bench, the series commencing with Chief Justice Osgoode, who was appointed on the passing of the Constitutional Act in 1791 and ending very worthily with Sir M. C. Cameron, who died in 1887. The work is rendered interesting by personal reminiscence, is enlivened by anecdote, and, as not a few of these men played important parts in public life, is welcome to the historical and general as well as to the professional reader.

A MONTHLY
REVIEW**THE BYSTANDER**OF
CURRENT EVENTS,
CANADIAN AND GENERAL.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
The Opening of the Session.	137
The Formation of Third Parties.	138
The Dual Language in the North-West.	140
The Liberal Leadership.	140
Mr. Meredith's Position.	141
Mr. Meredith and Education.	142
Titles of Honour	143
The Affray among the Dailies.	145
Commercial Union.	146
The War of Races in the South.	147
The State of Europe.	148
Monarchy in Europe.	149
Ireland and the Land Bill.	150
Cardinal Manning and the Strikes.	153
Divorce.	153
Protectionism.	155
Mr. Henry George's Theory.	158
Labour Journalism and the Toronto Club Ball.	160
Equal Rights in Society.	163
The Modern Language Association.	164
The New Professor of Philosophy.	165
Renan's Agnostic Manifesto.	165
Weismann on Life and Death.	166
Household Service.	168
Lord Lorne as a Novelist.	169
Mr. Kingsford's Canadian History.	170
M. Masson's North-West Fur Traders.	171

Toronto:**HUNTER, ROSE & COMPANY, 25 WELLINGTON ST.****PUBLISHERS.****WHOLESALE AGENTS:****TORONTO NEWS CO., TORONTO.****MONTREAL NEWS CO. MONTREAL**

Digitized by Google

JOS. M. SORLEY,

TELEPHONE 1398.

Real Estate Broker,

39 ADELAIDE ST. EAST.

INVITES the attention of the public to call and examine his List of Properties, of which the following are specially recommended as being extra good investments :

The OLD BETHUNE PROPERTY, on the North-East corner of Adelaide and John Streets. This property has three frontages, and will double in value very soon.

Bay Street, two blocks.

Albert Street, corner of Teraulay, 54 x 170 feet.

Bloor Street, corner of Brunswick Avenue, 150 x 130 feet.

Madison Avenue, 550 feet. Huron Street, 350 feet.

Splendid block of over 1,000 feet in the Brockton addition.

Readers of the BYSTANDER having property for sale would do well to place them on my list early, as I have numerous clients looking for good investments.

Loans Negotiated.

Investments Made.

Rents Collected.

JOS. M. SORLEY,

TELEPHONE 1398.

39 ADELAIDE ST. EAST.

PIANOS

The Standard Pianos of the World,

STEINWAY & SONS

(NEW YORK)

CHICKERING & SONS

(NEW YORK)

HAINES BROS.

(NEW YORK)

Inspection is also Solicited of

"The Nordheimer Piano."

Which is acknowledged by the most eminent Musicians throughout the Dominion to be

The Leading and Favorite Canadian Instrument.

A. & S. NORDHEIMER,

TORONTO AND MONTREAL.

Branches at Ottawa, Hamilton, London.

Digitized by Google

THE BYSTANDER.

FEBRUARY, 1890.

THE Government proposes, it seems, that little shall be done at Ottawa this session. The Government proposes, but the Opposition may dispose. The leaders of the Opposition will be greatly wanting, both to their interest and their duty if in the present situation they fail to call the attention of the country to the working of a system under which farm property in this Province has fallen in value to the extent of twenty-two and a-half millions in six years, the farmer is depressed, country towns dependent on trade with him are declining, vast mineral resources lie undeveloped, our shipping disappears from the lakes, the debt has increased to two hundred and sixty millions, the burden of taxation has been aggravated in proportion, the cost of living has risen to thirty-five per cent. more than it is in an old and overcrowded country, smuggling has spread along the Border to the injury of lawful trade, the very flower of our population is leaving us, and the promises of Government have been miserably belied with regard to the North-West, in the whole of which, after all these years, instead of the myriads promised, there are not above a hundred and fifty thousand white inhabitants, including Icelanders, Mennonites and Mormons, while a great population, largely composed of Canadian emigrants, is filling the farms and towns on the other side of the Line; the counter-vailing benefits received by the country being a number of baronetcies and knighthoods and the creation of a few great fortunes which the possessors are apt to carry away to

the brilliant society of England. If the industry, energy and thrift of the Canadian people have struggled gallantly against the effects of this policy and kept the country up to a level of which we may still be proud, this does not render the policy less injurious. When Lord Stanley, in the speech put into his mouth, dilated on the great development of all our resources, and notably of our mineral resources, since the days of his predecessors, it must surely have been with some consciousness of the nature of the ceremony which he was performing. If in the land of Mumbo Jumbo it were the custom that at the opening of a tribal assembly one man should deliver as his own a speech which another man had written we should moralize pleasantly on the grotesque habits of uncivilized nations.

"We have knocked Truth and Righteousness into a cocked hat" was the exulting cry of a Machinist Liberal after the West Lambton election. Knocking Truth and Righteousness into a cocked hat is perhaps the best definition that could have been given of the function of a Machine. The leaders probably judge somewhat differently, and know that the secession of nearly eight hundred electors from the party lines where the Machine candidate was very strong and the independent candidate very weak, is a warning that the cocked hat into which Truth and Righteousness are to be finally knocked has not yet been found. It is pretty manifest also that the Government is afraid to open East Toronto and is keeping the Collectorship of the Toronto Customs vacant on that account. The leaders themselves however have shown, in this Jesuit affair, that the peculiar shrewdness generated by their calling as politicians is sometimes accompanied by a loss of touch with common sentiment which betrays them into tactical errors. The indignation caused by the endowment with public money of the most hateful and deadly of anti-social conspiracies, natural as it seems, evidently took them by surprise.

Since the West Lambton election the leadership of a Third Party seems to have been formally accepted by the Rev. Dr.

Sutherland. Dr. Sutherland by his character as well as by his ability as a preacher and speaker, is well-entitled to lead a moral movement, and he is perfectly in his right even on the principles of the party system. That system must have a remedy for cases in which both the regular parties fail to do their duty. In the present case not only have they failed to do their duty but they have actually coalesced, as Dr. Sutherland and his friends would say, against "truth and righteousness." Coalesce they assuredly did in the Stanstead election, and throughout this conflict they have in great measure dropped their hostility to each other while they combined to assail independence. Mr. David Mills could not abuse Tories more roundly than he abused Liberals who were so unreasonably faithful to principle as to refuse to court Ultramontaniam for a political end. But the creation of a new party is an expensive as well as a troublesome process. It involves the erection of a new Machine. Nor can you be at all sure that your new party will not presently bear to Truth and Righteousness about the same relation as the old parties. Six or seven times in some countries of Europe the impure liquid of faction has been run off from old party receptacles into new; and it remains as impure in the last receptacle as it was in the first.

Not the formation of Third Parties, but the emancipation of public life from party altogether and a return to national government, will be the ultimate aim at all events of the true reformer, while he may see that the party system is established at present, that he cannot hope at once to disestablish it, and that so long as it prevails public men and actions must be judged by its rules. The system is everywhere in a pronounced state of decadence. Sectionalism has thoroughly set in, and all attempts to restore discipline have proved hopeless, so that hardly anywhere can a party be found large enough to form a stable basis for a Government. In France no Government has been able to live six months, and Germany would be in the same plight did not the iron hand of Bismarck uphold a rule practically irrespective of party. In England, the mother of the

system, no party has now a majority, and the Government leans on a prop supplied by a section of its nominal opponents. In Australia administrations flit over the scene like shadows. In Canada we have had comparative stability, but it has been the fruit of corruption, carried on through subsidies and Government appropriations, for which the condition of Quebec and the indifference of the remoter Provinces to Dominion politics have afforded a propitious field. The next demise of the leadership will probably be the end even of the sinister stability which exists here.

—Mr. McCarthy having put his hand to the plough does not look backwards. The debate on his motion for the abolition of the dual language in the North-West can hardly fail to make the dry bones of party rattle. Let us hope that at all events counsel will not be darkened by false analogies. True analogy there is none. The medley of language as well as of races and religions in the case of Switzerland is aboriginal and immemorial, while the very fact of its being a medley, not an antagonism, makes it comparatively harmless. In the case of Austria the use of more than one political language is rendered necessary by the union of different nations under one Imperial Crown. Neither of these cases, nor as we believe any other case that can be mentioned, bears a real resemblance to the attempt to inflict duality on a community in its cradle by means of legislative intrigue, and for the purposes of ecclesiastical propagandism. In Germany and in the United States there is a mixture of races and languages; yet neither nation recognizes for political purposes any language but one. This is a British Colony. The Treaty of Cession secured to the French the enjoyment of their language and religion in Quebec: the rest is ours.

—It is difficult to see how Mr. Laurier after formally endorsing a Nationalist and Ultramontane candidate in Quebec

can continue to lead the Liberals of Ontario. Unnatural and hypocritical alliances always end in disaster. People are surprised that Mr. Joly, a French Protestant, should come out in defence of the Jesuit grant: but Mr. Joly's instincts, though he has not of late taken part in politics, are still those of the regular politician. His plea that the Jesuit Estate was an escheat to which the Jesuits had a moral claim, and that the Act was the settlement of that claim, is palpably untenable and has already been renounced by Mr. Mercier who describes the Act as having "repaired the despoilment of the Jesuits by the same George III. who had despoiled the American Revolutionary Fathers of their rights and liberties." There was in fact nothing to escheat. The Order having been under the ban of British law and unprotected by the Treaty of Cession, the estates were forfeit even before the suppression of the Order, and were at the disposal of the Crown, as is clearly implied by that opinion of Solicitor-General Wedderburn, of which Sir John Thompson and all who argue on his side so carefully steer clear. But supposing the estates to have escheated by the suppression of the Order, can Mr. Joly contend that the revival of the Order by the Pope gave it any claim, legal or moral, to estates held before the suppression? Supposing the Pope were to revive the Order of the Templars, would he confer a moral claim to the property now held by the two Inns of Court? Would any Roman Catholic Government listen for a moment to a demand like that which Mr. Joly calls upon a Protestant Government to admit? But we repeat Mr. Mercier's own avowal has settled the question and proved that the Act was intended as a blow against the Conquest Settlement and at all by whom that settlement is upheld.

—Mr. Meredith's encounter with the ecclesiastical dragon of Kingston is likely rather to confirm him in the attitude which he had begun to assume. Neither in this controversy nor on the platform has he said a syllable implying the slightest ill-

feeling towards Roman Catholics or the slightest tendency to deprive them or their Church of any liberties or privileges enjoyed by their Protestant fellow subjects. In this he is at one with the avowed friends of Equal Rights. At the same time he is being manifestly borne forward by the swelling current of opinion from the position of manager of a donkey engine to that of a defender of British and Protestant Right in the British and Protestant Province, and a guardian of our political independence against the domination of the "solid vote" thrown now into one scale now into the other at the ecclesiastical word of command. Unless some hand from behind pulls him back or his own resolution fails him before the Provincial elections, we shall at least have a more interesting contest than we had on the last occasion.

—Mr. Meredith's proposal to take education out of politics is well received and will help to fill his sails at the election unless the Government alters its course so as to take the wind out of them. The abolition of the Council of Public Instruction a twelvemonth after its reorganisation was not a deliberate measure or dictated by experience: it was caused by a personal crisis in the Board, the wrath of the Chief Superintendent having been kindled by the revision of his text-books, the inquiry instituted into his Depositories, the free exercise by the Council of its power of election to the headships of Training Colleges, and generally by the curb which the activity of the reorganized Council put upon his autocracy. Had the Government been firm enough to enforce upon its Chief Superintendent an observance of the rules of public life, or had there been a strong man in the Chair of the Council, all might have gone well. At the pass to which things had been allowed to come the change was inevitable, nor were there wanting other arguments in its favour, such as the convenience of having in the Legislature a Minister responsible for the expenditure. It seems to be felt, however, that the result

of the experiment is unsatisfactory and that it would be well to return to the old system or something like it. A Council is of course unfit for ordinary administration, which must be placed in the hands of some regular officer. But for such matters as the selection of text-books and the regulation of the curriculum it is useful. The Council was certainly free from any influence, political or commercial. Nor did it show any such tendency to ecclesiasticism as the Council of Instruction in Manitoba is said to betray. It is good for the educational profession to have at its head a body of its most eminent representatives. As Minister of Education we must take whomever, in the somewhat fortuitous distribution of offices among the leaders of a political party, it may please fate to give us, and if the man happens to be unfamiliar with the special subject and obliged to rely on others the result is an irresponsible Vizier or a Camarilla. With the withdrawal of education from politics Mr. Meredith, it may be surmised, will combine a cautious and conservative policy with regard to education generally. It is time that we should take care what we are about if we do not mean to educate country life and farm industry out of existence.

—That baronetcies should be revived in Canada and more knighthoods bestowed by a Tory government of England was most natural, since a Tory government embodies the hope of propagating aristocratic sentiment on this side of the water and saving a part of the New World from democracy. Vain is that hope and far from beneficial, as we think, to Canadian society are the means employed for its realization. To titles bestowed by the community on the holders of public trusts there can be no sort of objection: these are real titles of honour: democracy need not renounce everything that is impressive or graceful; some day perhaps it will evolve its own æsthetics. But these baronetcies and knighthoods are not annexed to public trusts, nor are they bestowed by the community. They

are too often the prize of servility or of undignified solicitation, and we could even point to a case where a title was used, at the instance of a Party leader, to cancel the just sentence of the nation against his associate in corruption. Their effect is in a measure to estrange the public man from his own country and attach him to the skirts of the aristocracy from which the title comes. Amidst all the criticism of Mr. Edward Blake let it not be forgotten that he did Canada the honour to refuse distinction which was not to be conferred by the nation which he served. To say that the sacrifice was great would almost be a satire on humanity. Nevertheless it was not small. A fountain of honour by all means let us have, but let it be here. One creation is satisfactory, inasmuch as it recognizes the fact that the Grand Trunk, with comparatively little aid from the country, has perhaps done more for it and better earned the title of "national" than a rival, which having received over a hundred millions on the ground of its exclusively national character is now not only a private commercial enterprise but partly an American road, fighting Canadian private enterprises virtually with public funds and discriminating in its rates against Canadian traffic.

Of Q. C's. we have had simultaneous showers from two opposite quarters, and soon they will be coming up "even into our kneading-troughs." Mr. Mowat's batch is at all events the more creditable. Of the appointments in the other batch some are condemned by Conservatives who care for the honour of their profession. Not long ago the indignation of all honest Conservatives was still more aroused by an appointment to a judgeship, and the influence in that case was not merely political but sectarian. Yet we flatter ourselves that we emulate England where, saving the necessary recognition of the claims of Law Officers of the Crown, judgeships are now given irrespective of party, and the silk gown is bestowed with the strictest regard to professional standing. The blame rests not so much with Sir John Macdonald himself as with those who by their adulation have filled him with the belief that he

is absolute master of the country, and licensed at his sovereign will and pleasure to purchase political support with a seat on the Bench of Justice and fling the honours of the Bar to a man of blemished character or to one who has hardly ever been in Court. The practice arraigned by Mr. Laurier of keeping open appointments indefinitely for party purposes, in which Sir John Macdonald so freely indulges, is another exhibition of the same insolent autocracy. Rumour speaks of an appointment to the Senate which would throw all other excesses in the use of patronage into the shade; but a contemporary has placed the record of the aspirant's career distinctly before the Governor-General, and it is to be hoped that his Excellency will not want the firmness to guard the honour of the country and his own.

—We have been treated to a concert of unusual power and sweetness by the Toronto dailies, one of which is alleged to have been detected in treasonably furnishing the politicians at Washington with the "secret information" that there is an exodus from Canada and that we have some annexationists among us. If the accusers will only look back to their own columns they will see that hardly a day has passed for two or three years without their charging the opposite party, which includes half the people of the country, with annexationist aims, and thus conveying to the Americans and the world at large in an exaggerated form the very "secret information" which they upbraid their rival with imparting. It is not likely that people of sense will draw from the noise of this affray any inference but the true one, that our great Toronto dailies have not all of them room to live. We should as soon think of allowing the chorus on the shingles to affect our view of a great question. Mr. Mulock therefore may be calm unless he is very anxious to display his superior attachment to the Throne. Old journalists see with pain that the correspondent of one journal can be found to act as spy upon the cor-

respondent of another journal. But the laws of literary war and the common interest of the profession have long since been given to the winds. One thing, at all events, this affray has clearly proved : Commercial Union is not Annexation.

—The renewal of Mr. Hitt's and of Mr. Butterworth's motion shows that Commercial Union is not dead at Washington. The course of the session will probably show that it or its equivalent is still alive at Ottawa. That there is in the Republican Party at Washington a section inclined to a less friendly policy towards Canada as a British dependency has never been denied. To that section Mr. Hoar apparently belongs. There were reasons at one time for fearing that Mr. Blaine, a far more important personage, belonged to it also. Mr. Blaine is from Maine where Protectionism is not less narrow and bitter than it is here. In Pennsylvania, among the manufacturers there is another set of the same extreme stripe, the members of which used to drink wisdom from the lips of Mr. Henry Carey, who frankly avowed that the great object of his hatred was a trader. Among its organists evidently is Mr. Gibson, of whose deliverances *The Mail* makes the same use against the cause which it once most ably upheld as it makes of those of Mr. Hoar. But a section of the Republican party is not the party, much less is it Congress ; and Congress as a whole has more or less to be reckoned with on commercial questions in regard to which local interests often run athwart the regular party lines. On all questions the grand object of politicians at Washington, as well as at Ottawa, is to get some coign of vantage for the next election : to this Government is everywhere reduced under the party system ; and we must expect that in such a jungle of intrigue the march of any great question will be difficult and slow. Opinion, if it advances, will in the end control the action of the politicians, but the advance of opinion among great masses takes time. Those who have joined a movement expecting a quick return

in the shape of votes will fall away. Those who have joined it in the public interest must learn to be patient as well as hopeful, and hopeful as well as patient. The Commercial Union literature has all the time been circulating, and the desire for a change of policy among the farmers has grown so much that, in spite of the party lines, it can hardly fail to have its effect on the next general election. The American money, which Mr. Chapleau does not scruple to charge the opponents of his monopolist Government with receiving for political purposes, will therefore not be needed. This calumny has been heard before, and on that occasion the President of the Commercial Union Club met it, so far as his organization was concerned, by stating that a contribution to their fund had been offered by the head of an American firm on behalf of his Canadian Branch and had been declined on the ground that the Association, acting solely in the interest of Canada, could not receive aid from any but a strictly Canadian source.

—The Barnwell tragedy in South Carolina shows that the terrible problem of race in the Southern States is no nearer its solution. The political question between the races has been settled so far by not allowing the negroes to vote or not counting their votes when given. In this they have acquiesced and probably they have lost little by it, since had they voted they would have infallibly been the prey of the lowest class of demagogues. There is no use in refusing to recognize differences of political aptitude or pretending after what we have seen in Hayti that the negro is ready for self-government. But the blacks have also been the victims of constant outrage and of atrocious lynching. The savage barbarism which is the fruit of slave-holding will probably linger for generations in the Southern character. It seems clear that in the case of six out of the eight negroes who with every circumstance of cruelty and insult were lynched at Barnwell, there was not even any evidence of guilt, much less a judicial verdict. Most

of them, it is reported, were in custody merely as witnesses of an alleged crime. Two races cannot live together on these terms, nor can any civilized government permit several millions of its citizens, whatever their colour, to be deprived not only of their political but of their personal rights and shot or hanged like dogs. It seems evident that public opinion in South Carolina supports the lynchers and sets justice at defiance: in this case there is nothing for it but military occupation. The fact is the negro is no more allowed a trial than he is allowed a vote. On the merest suspicion of any offence against the whites he is incontinently lynched. Unless superior power intervenes there will presently be an outbreak of the hatred of race on a larger scale, and instead of trickling in outrage blood will stream in massacre. If, on the other hand, there should be a great exodus of negroes, of which there now appear some symptoms, who will raise the cotton? The whites cannot do it.

—In Europe there is still peace: there are still assurances of peace; but war is in the air. That which causes the half-drawn sword to linger in the sheath probably is not so much regard for peace as the expensiveness of mobilization, which becomes the more formidable the more the finances have been exhausted by preparation. The "hasty spark" struck by the outrageous conduct of a Portuguese filibuster in Central Africa which in calmer times would "straight have grown cold again," is in these times enough to put the nations in a flame of excitement. France, from whose inveterate enmity England and the dependencies of England have most to fear is preparing to lash herself into a fit of Anglophobia by a grand revival of the worship of Joan of Arc, conveniently forgetting, as she always does, that Joan was as much the victim of French faction as of British invasion, and that one of her two judges was a French Bishop. It seems certain that Russia is assiduously strengthening her military base and per-

fecting her means of transporting troops in Central Asia. The conclusion to which calm observers, such as Mr. Curzon, free alike from Russo-phobism and Russo-philism are led is that Russia has no serious intention of conquering India, but that she does intend by pressing England in that quarter to open the road to Constantinople. Of the brilliant achievements of Lord Beaconsfield, nothing now remains except Cyprus, a forlorn island in a dead angle of the Mediterranean, and the mortal hatred of Russia, once England's firmest ally. Two Russian engineers the other day took a trip over the C.P.R. to gather hints for the construction of the railway in Siberia, a compliment which suggests, by the way, that Canada is Siberian. Perhaps they noted as they went what at certain points in the mountain section a little dynamite would do. In Central Africa a new scene of jealous rivalry among the European powers has been opened and a fresh field has been sown with the dragon's teeth.

—The fall of monarchy in Brazil has produced more serious effects than it was possible at first to foresee. A blow has evidently been given to the stability of monarchy in Portugal and even in Spain. There can be no doubt as to the declining strength of the institution. If in England the Crown seems to sit more securely on the head of royalty than elsewhere, this is because the wearer has long been divested of any political power. But the violent opposition aroused among the people by the proposal to grant money to any member of the Royal family shows that even in England hereditary monarchy is almost dead at the root. The only hold which it retains is social, and this is fast being impaired by the unwillingness of the present wearer of the Crown to perform its social duties. Her refusal to revisit Ireland, where she was admirably received, persisted in notwithstanding the entreaties of all her best advisers, is likely to prove disastrous to her family as well as to the country.

That the Russian prison system generally is about as much below other prison systems as Russian civilization generally is below the civilization of other countries, seems to us to be the upshot of the most trustworthy evidence on the subject. But there seems to be no longer any doubt about the massacre in Siberia. Why do not American legislatures pass resolutions of censure on the oppressor and of sympathy with the oppressed? This is surely an atrocity fully as great as the imprisonment of Wm. O'Brien, or the execution of the Phoenix Park murderers. But on Russia, though her iron heel was on Poland and whatever atrocities she might commit, the American politicians have always smiled. Through some peculiarity in their moral structure it is only Irish woe that wrings their hearts, only British misdeeds that excite their righteous indignation.

—The British Cabinet is in labour with another Irish land measure, and it no doubt believes that this time the problem will be solved. It is to be hoped that a settlement of some kind will presently be attained or there will be no such thing as security of property or faith in contracts left in the island. The agrarian root of the Irish difficulty is deeper than the political, but deeper again than the agrarian root is over population, which no changes of the law can directly affect. On a land unfitted by its climate for cereals the people multiply and are encouraged by their church to multiply without limit; they can subsist only on the potato, and when that barbarous and treacherous food fails, comes and must come famine. This is the hard fundamental fact which no legislation, much less any rhetoric, can annul. No remedy apparently can be thorough short of thirty years of strong government, with systematic emigration and extirpation of the potato. But such a remedy could be applied only by a Cromwell riding into power on the wings of victory in civil war. Not that civil war is absolutely out of the question if things in England go on as they have been going for the last ten years.

To show on what sort of facts the people of the United States form their opinions about the Irish question, the *New York Tribune*, which may be said to be at the head of American journalism, tells its readers that Ireland is by nature a great manufacturing country, that her rich fields of coal are practically boundless, but England up to fifty years ago imposed extraordinary restrictions on her trade. Fear of the revival of Irish manufactures "is the reason why Manchester, Bradford, Birmingham, and all other manufacturing centres in England so bitterly oppose Home Rule." A writer who undertakes to enlighten his readers on this subject might be supposed to know that the Union which swept away the restrictions on Irish trade was passed not fifty but ninety years ago. The bounds of the "boundless" expanse of coal fields are well ascertained, and Ireland imports two millions of tons of coal annually for her domestic consumption. On the other hand, nearly two millions of her people find employment in Great Britain, chiefly in the manufacturing cities, while England affords to the natural produce of Ireland by far the best market for such produce in the world. If the writer in the *Tribune* had cared enough for truth even to look into the 'Parliamentary Companion' or 'Whitaker's Almanac' he would have found that Bradford sends to Parliament two Home Rule members out of three, and Manchester three out of six. Birmingham sends Unionists from motives purely political, not because her manufacturers of small arms are likely to suffer from Irish competition, much less from disunion. Leeds sends three Home Rulers out of five. Newcastle, Wolverhampton, Rochdale, Derby, are Home Rule. Bradlaugh and Labouchere sit for a manufacturing city. The manufacturing centres generally are Radical and Home Rule. The policy which the *Tribune* recommends and supposes, with good reason, that Mr. Parnell means to adopt, is to return to the commercial night which prevailed before the Union and set up a corps of monopolists to prey by taxation on the general industry of Ireland. Suppose England were to follow suit and close her market

against Irish produce and industry, what does the *Tribune* think would become of Ireland?

For this return to Protectionism Mr. Gladstone, the arch-Freetrader, is to pave the way. Does Mr. Gladstone ever look back on his former self? "Amongst the scenes that are now unhappily being enacted in Ireland by certain persons we may lose sight of the great and unquestionable progress of that country. It has achieved material progress in a degree most remarkable for a country with little variety of pursuit. I do not believe there is a labouring population in all Europe—although the condition of the Irish labourer leaves much to desire—which in the course of the last twenty years has made a progress equal to that of the labouring population in Ireland. Let me look at the farming class, which, as you know, may be said almost to constitute the body of the nation, understood as the term is understood in Ireland—let me look at the indication of their surplus wealth. Forty years ago the deposits in the Irish banks, which are the indication of the amount of their free savings, were about five millions. Some fifteen years later than that, I think they had risen to some eleven or twelve millions. There are now of deposits in the Irish banks, which represent almost wholly the honest earnings and savings of Irish farmers, a sum of nearly thirty millions of money. Of course, I don't mean to say that the whole of these are agricultural savings, but an enormous proportion is of agricultural savings, and, at any rate, you cannot mistake the meaning and the force of the comparison between the thirty millions in round numbers of the present day and the five millions which were in the Irish banks forty years ago. If I am to speak of moral progress in Ireland, I say that it has been remarkable, and it is associated with legal progress in regard to every class of legal offences but one. There is still one painful and grievous exception—the exception of the agrarian offences." Would any one believe that these were words used only nine years ago by the man, then in power, who, now that he has lost power and is seeking to regain it by help of the Irish vote, pro-

nounces the Union an utter failure and declares that there is no hope for Ireland except in its repeal? Will posterity have the slightest doubt as to the cause of the change?

—A notable feature of the late strikes was the prominent part played by Cardinal Manning. That ambitious and scheming hierarch (for such he notoriously is) intimated some time ago pretty plainly that, the day of kings and their favourites being over, and the people having succeeded to power, the Church must cultivate her influence with the people. While despotism reigned Rome was everywhere the confederate of the despot; when despotism was revived, as it was by Ferdinand of Spain after 1815, and by Louis Napoleon in France, she welcomed and seconded its revival. To despotism is her natural affinity; but an alliance with temporal power, be it that of despot or of demagogue, is a necessity of which she is conscious, and her consciousness of which is fatal to the sincerity of her belief in her own claims as the Church of the truth. She has now lost her temporal kingdom in Italy and is becoming, even in Europe, to a great extent disestablished, so that her revenues as well as her moral support must henceforth be drawn largely from the people. It will not be surprising, in spite of her condemnation of Father McGlynn, if she should execute a change of front and try to recover her power by placing herself at the head of a social revolution. Significant utterances have been heard of late from some of her priesthood and even from her head. In that revolution, did she invoke it, she would assuredly perish, for her hierarchy has neither command enough of the popular mind nor statesmanship enough to control such a movement; but in the meantime she might add not a little to the perplexities and dangers of the situation.

—The *North American Review* has a symposium—a word which, by the way, has travelled as strange a road as “Pontiff,” “Marshal,” or “Constable”—on what may emphatically be

called the burning topic of Divorce. The debaters are Cardinal Gibbons, the Anglican Bishop of New York, and the Agnostic Colonel Ingersoll. The Cardinal looks down from the serene height of Catholic morality on the immoral aberrations of an unbelieving world. We would ask him to turn his eyes to the history of marriage and of the relations between the sexes generally in France, Spain, Italy, Austria, Morocco, and other countries where his Church has had her way. We would also remind him that if his Church exalts marriage by making it a sacrament she degrades it by pronouncing celibacy the holier state. Further, we would observe, that in the period preceding the Reformation the practice of granting dissolutions of marriage, on the pretended grounds of consanguinity and pre-contract, had virtually introduced among the wealthy a license of divorce comparable to that of Illinois or Indiana. The Agnostic, of course, is for freedom both of divorce and of re-marriage. "Would you force a woman to live with a man whom she has ceased to love?" Yes, we would, if she has freely become his wife, freely interchanged with him the marriage vows, above all if she has borne him children. Out of regard for her own real happiness and for her character, we would forbid her to pass as soon as passion was sated from the arms of one man into those of another. If the continuance of romantic love were to be the condition of fidelity how many marriages would outlive the honeymoon? Marriages which can be so lightly dissolved are of course as lightly contracted, and thus the evil is multiplied at both ends. Mr. Phelps, in *The Forum*, says that if the right of re-marriage were taken away nine-tenths, perhaps ninety-nine hundredths, of the divorce cases which now crowd the calendars of the Courts and pollute the newspapers would disappear. In other words, the real cause, in the vast majority of cases, is not the intolerable irksomeness of the existing union so much as a desire to contract another. The law is in the wildest confusion, each State having a different law from the rest. In some States the laxity of the law and the laxity of the tribunals together amount

almost to free love. When a woman can get a divorce because her husband keeps her awake by talking, because he does not take her for rides, or because he has enlisted in the Navy, and a man can get a divorce on grounds not less frivolous and grotesque, it would be better to allow people to separate and marry again as they choose without prostituting the Courts of Law. Mr. Gladstone has addressed to the Americans a homily which perhaps might have had more effect if the preacher had not been socially countenancing the matrimonial liberalism of some of his political friends at home. He says very truly that the soundness of the State depends on that of the family which is the unit of the State. He might have added that while his family may rebuild the State, the State can never rebuild the family. The alarm bell however has been rung most effectively by the Rev. Dr. Dike, who has made this momentous subject his own: American morality is now on its guard and the tide in that quarter appears to be on the turn. In Canada, on the other hand, the matrimonial morality of Chicago is struggling to effect a lodgement and apparently with a fair chance of success.

—In another symposium Mr. Gladstone upholds Free Trade and Mr. Blaine Protection. Mr. Gladstone need only point to the fruits of British Free Trade which surround Mr. Blaine, into whose country streams for investment the vast overflow of wealth which half a century of Free Trade has produced in an island not larger than a single State of the Union. What practical proof can there be of anything if the commercial wealth of England is not a proof of the wisdom of her commercial policy? Mr. Gladstone points to the immorality of Protectionism as a system under which a favoured class swells its gains by taxing the rest of the community. We might press this argument further and show that Protectionism is the policy of corruption. For what but corruption determines which class shall be favoured? What class is favoured in

Canada but that which subscribes to the election fund of the Government? Mr. Gladstone might also have shown that Protectionism is the system of inhumanity. What is more inhuman than to cut off nation from nation and put a bar upon the interchange which, attended as it must be by friendly intercourse and union of interests, would go far, if it were allowed free play, to make one heart as well as one harvest for the world? There are also the evils, moral as well as financial, of smuggling, which are evidently on the increase under our own Protective tariff.

Mr. Blaine must have felt his own weakness when he was reduced to charging Mr. Gladstone with himself contravening Free Trade principles by paying for the transmission of Ocean mails. He pleads that the circumstances of the United States are not the same as those of the country for which Mr. Gladstone prescribes. In this there is some truth, but it is not truth which will avail his cause. The reason why the United States have not suffered as England would have suffered and as Canada is suffering from Protectionism is that the United States are not, like England or Canada, a country but a continent, producing almost everything in itself. Yet Protectionism has wiped out of existence the mercantile marine of the United States and with it that nautical element of the national character which is the subject of a striking passage in De Tocqueville.

Protectionists point triumphantly to the general halt in the progress of Free Trade and the relapse of some nations into Protectionism. Universal suffrage may have widened the basis of government, but for the time at least it has put the world into the hands of lower intelligence than that of Turgot, Pitt, Huskisson, Peel and Cavour. The consequence has been a return in commercial policy of the blind cupidity of the Middle Ages. It appears from what Mr. David A. Wells says that not only international but inter-parochial Protectionism is raising its head again. The laundries of Paris demand protection against those of the country. There is, we believe,

a law on the Statute book of one of the American States restraining the manufacture of pure vinegar in the interest of people who could only make it impure. Having killed trade by Protectionism, the Solons of the system undertake to revive it by bounties, paid at the public cost, and this policy which it might have been supposed could emanate only from an asylum for economical idiots, stalks again more than a hundred years after Adam Smith. Monopoly besets us anew in the form of combines, trusts and tyrannical Trade-unionism, as well as in that of Protective tariffs. Yet the footprints are not all turned backwards. New South Wales has been steadily true to Free Trade and has proved its wisdom by outstripping in the race of prosperity her neighbour and rival Victoria, though Victoria with her gold mines had a much better start. In 1866, when they set out, New South Wales with Free Trade, Victoria with Protection, Victoria was 200,000 ahead in population, a million sterling ahead in revenue, eight millions ahead in trade, a hundred and fifty thousand acres ahead in cultivated land: she was far ahead in manufactures and was the equal of New South Wales in shipping. In 1888, New South Wales was one million ahead in revenue, seven millions ahead in exports, and only one million behind in imports. She was even slightly ahead in manufacturing industries. The general parity of conditions and the identity of the population in these contrasted colonies of Australia make the experiment of Free Trade in New South Wales very conclusive. The proposal of the Zollverein among the nations of Central Europe is also a movement in favour of Free Trade, which would thereby be introduced over a large area. In the same way, Napoleon's continental system, which is sometimes cited by Protectionists as an example in favour of their theory, was from the vast extent of his empire practically a large measure of Free Trade.

Where is the proof, we would ask by the way, that Sir John Macdonald is by conviction a Protectionist? He has taken up Protectionism for a political purpose, but where is his profession of Protectionist doctrine or his reasoning in support of

it to be found ? Just before the election of 1878 he positively disclaimed Protectionism and declared that he was only for readjustment. His saying, "Reciprocity of Trade or Reciprocity of Tariffs," clearly implies that the first is the preferable alternative, and that Reciprocity of Tariffs is only the instrument for enforcing Reciprocity of Trade. We ask once more what is the proof that he is a Protectionist by conviction ?

—The Anti-Poverty Society charges us with misrepresenting Mr. Henry George who it says "proposes no disturbance of land titles, no dispossession, no redistribution or leasing by the State, but simply an appropriation by the community of that value which it caused by the community, and thus securing free from taxation that which the individual produces." The seventh chapter of *Progress and Poverty* opens with these words : "The truth is, and from this truth there can be no escape, that there is and can be no just title to an exclusive possession of the soil, and that private property in land is a bold, base, enormous wrong like that of chattel slavery." Can it possibly be said that this imports no disturbance of titles to land or dispossession of private owners ? Does not it plainly import that every farmer in Ontario is a wrongful possessor of what he deems his freehold and has no better title to it than he would have to a slave ? In that case who is the owner but the State, and how can it grant anything but leases on sufferance at the utmost ? If it gave the fee or even a lease for years it would be renewing the enormous wrong. The whole chapter which follows is a practical amplification of the opening sentence : "The anti-slavery movement in the United States commenced with talk of compensating owners, but when four million of slaves were emancipated the owners got no compensation, nor did they clamour for any, and by the time the people of any such country as England or the United States are sufficiently aroused to the injustice and disadvantages of individual ownership of land to induce them to attempt its nationali-

zation, they will be sufficiently aroused to nationalize it in a much more direct and easy way than by purchase : they will not trouble themselves about compensating the proprietors of land." This is pretty plain, is it not ? Further, the operation proposed is represented under the figure of a lawsuit, 'The People *vs.* the Land Owners,' in which the land is taken from its wrongful possessor 'the land owner,' and adjudged to its rightful owner 'the People,' and we are reminded that no compensation is given to the losing party in a lawsuit. The comparison is preposterous, since the losing party in the supposed lawsuit never had a legal title, whereas the land owner unquestionably has, and the measure proposed by Mr. George is not a judicial proceeding before an impartial tribunal, but a high-handed spoliation of one class by another. "The value caused by the community" is apparently the same thing as "unearned increment," and the appropriation of unearned increment is scouted by Mr. George as a ridiculously inadequate measure of justice. Mr. George is a writer of whom, without breach of loyalty to free thought, one may speak with plainness. He talks with levity, nay with exultation, of despoiling a multitude of persons whom he himself allows to have purchased in good faith, as well they might, considering that the property was guaranteed by the law of the community of which they and Mr. George himself were members, and that the practice of holding such property has been sanctioned by the custom of the whole civilized world for thousands of years. Does not plain justice say that if a description of property, the possession of which the whole community has through its laws solemnly and immemorially ratified, the reform ought to be made at the expense of the whole community ? The fact, we are afraid, is that with a good many of Mr. George's admirers what took was not so much the philosophy as the confiscation.

There is a nationalization of land without robbery which the Law Amendment Society has got introduced into the North-West and is now struggling to get introduced into Ontario. It is the Torrens System of land titles and conveyance, which in-

stead of exacting, each time a lot changes hands, fees for historical researches into the title, and thus in the case of small lots imposing a heavy fine on the transaction, enables every member of the nation to buy an acre of land by a process as simple as that by which he buys a yard of cloth. Experience has abundantly proved both the feasibility and the benefits of the system. The benefits are not economical only, but social, and the system commends itself to every statesman as the best antidote to the growing lust of socialistic confiscation. But there is prejudice, professional and general, to be overcome, and the Law Amendment Society needs such backing as public opinion can give it in pressing a reform at once truly popular and truly Conservative on the Government and legislature of this Province. The improvement is so manifest that a Bill embodying it drawn by a Conservative Chancellor almost passed the British House of Lords. At the last stage, when opposition is generally understood to be withdrawn, a set of those noble lords of the pigeon-shooting order who seldom show themselves in the House except for some selfish purpose, came down and threw out the Bill as anti-feudal. Such is the knowledge which the House of Lords has of its own position and such are the chances of its averting destruction by self-reform!

—The glories of the Toronto Club Ball have furnished Labour journalism with a text for a sermon on the inequalities of wealth which we have to thank some correspondent for sending to us. "The big building on York Street was filled with fashionable beauties and the chief rulers in the synagogue of caste. Women, the soft effulgence and rare beauty of whose pearls was only equalled by the snowy background of the bared bosoms on which they were displayed; women, whose eyes flashed with the light of perfect health and enjoyment; men high in the world of commerce—railway magnates and telegraph magnates, real estate dealers and street railway owners

—all indeed to whom Dame Rumour has given the reputation of great wealth and mighty influence were there. The revelers danced to the music of an imported band; the refreshments were of the most superb description; the rooms were magnificently decorated, the hired flunkies were gorgeous in new suits of the Club uniform, and all went merry as a marriage bell. The aristocracy of Toronto surpassed itself; it forgot for a time that this is a democratic country; it forgot for a time the great world lying in the lower grades of 'society'; it forgot for a time heaven and God and everything else, and, in an ecstasy of delight it fell down and worshipped itself—a great composite golden calf." The journalist pronounces the doom of wealth in the form of an apologue. Justice holds her court, and before it are brought one of the ladies with the pearls on their bosoms and a woman of the people, "bowed down and ragged and with a look of hopeless weariness on her face." The lady of the pearls is asked whether she has the title of labour to her wealth: it is at once assumed that she has not, and her jewels are forthwith taken from her and given to the woman of the people. Why is it to be assumed that she has not the title of labour to her wealth, if her husband has made it by hard work in an honourable profession or a useful branch of commerce, and if she herself has conscientiously done the duties of a wife, a mother and the head of a household, before putting on her pearls for the evening? Half the men at that ball had risen by labour, though of a superior kind, from the ranks to which jealousy longs to reduce them. The inequalities are indeed great and the contrasts painful, though to speak of the wife of a mechanic with good wages, setting out with her husband and children for her Saturday excursion as "bowed down and ragged and with a look of hopeless weariness on her face," would happily be absurd. But the responsibility rests on Justice herself if she represents the Maker of the Universe. He it was, not the lady with pearls or her compeers, who ordained that instead of a planet full of mechanics with high pay and short hours there should be this vast and varied scene, the inequalities and

contrasts of which, if you take into view all races, all times and all stages of civilization, are infinite, and throw those between the classes of any one community completely into the shade. The same Power has decreed that level as you will, and whatever violence you may use in the process, as soon as the havoc is over, the inequalities and contrasts shall again emerge. Bray society in the mortar of revolution: you will not annul the different powers of earning and saving inherent in its individual members any more than by breaking up a mass of matter you will annul the chemical properties inherent in the particles of which it is composed. Perhaps by the time this trial takes place, the great mystery will have been cleared up. Supreme Justice will have vindicated herself and all who stand at her bar will know why it was that she distributed her pearls so unequally. Not her pearls only, for if we could see into the bosoms on which they rest we shall find inequalities of happiness deeper and more mysterious than inequalities of pearls. When one class tells another that the "handwriting is on its wall," this is merely a mystical way of expressing envy and hatred, neither of which has so far done much to improve the lot of man. The handwriting is not on the wall of any set of people who in this most imperfect world are trying to do their duty in their station. It is on the wall of everyone who is not trying to do his duty, on that of the mechanic who, by scamping the plumbing poisons a household, as well as on that of the frivolous woman of fashion who squanders what she has not earned in selfish luxury and vulgar show. That pauperism waits on wealth and that to remove it you have only to abolish the wealthy class is a notion much cherished in certain quarters, but belied by facts. Nowhere is there more destitution than in barbarous or decayed communities where there is no wealthy class. Suppose the roof of the Toronto Club House had fallen upon the whole "synagogue of caste," would the mechanics of Toronto have been better off the next morning? Amusements every class must have of a kind suited to its tastes and means, and a ball costs no more in proportion

than a great Labour Procession or a day at the Industrial Exhibition. Not that we desire to break the force of any rational warning against selfish luxury, extravagance or vulgar ostentation. There is too much of them all among us, and we shall have to look to our ways, if not from higher motives, from fear of the mine which the bitter feelings excited by the reckless and vulgar display of wealth are charging beneath our feet.

—In the papers before New Year's Day appeared with equal honours the following brace of announcements:



**GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
TORONTO.**

HIS HONOR THE LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR WILL HOLD A RECEPTION AT GOVERNMENT HOUSE ON WEDNESDAY, 1ST OF JANUARY, BETWEEN THE HOURS OF 4 AND 5 O'CLOCK.
FREDK. C. LAW,
COMMANDER R. N.,
OFFICIAL SECRETARY.

ST. MICHAEL'S PALACE.

HIS GRACE THE ARCHBISHOP OF TORONTO WILL BE AT HOME ON
WEDNESDAY, THE 1ST OF JAN.,
BETWEEN THE HOURS OF 3 AND HALF-PAST 5 O'CLOCK, AT ST. MICHAEL'S PALACE,
TO THOSE DESIROUS OF CALLING.
J. F. McBRIDE,
SECRETARY.

In the report of the receptions, that of the Archbishop, whose office and position are unknown to the Commonwealth, was placed between that of the Lieutenant-Governor and that of the Mayor and on the same footing with theirs. It is surely time to put a gentle check on social as well as political encroachment, and upon the by no means harmless servility which is engendered. Not long ago a Protestant, who was at the time Speaker of the Senate, was seen to go on his knee before a Cardinal at a reception. No doubt he knelt, and knelt not in body only, but in soul, before the Catholic vote. The representative of the Roman Catholic Church in this

Province is entitled to the same measure of social respect as the representatives of the Anglican, Presbyterian, Methodist, or Baptist Church, and to no larger measure. But he apparently wishes to arrogate to himself a much larger measure; and people are so prone to worship title, even when it is assumed without warrant, and pageantry however hollow, that a *caveat* may be in season. Let a man call himself His Grace, or the Grand Patriarch, or the Most Worshipful Grand Arch, or Illustrious Brother, or anything else that he and his sect or society please within their own pale. But let not unauthorized rank be foisted on the Commonwealth, especially when it ministers and is intended to minister to political aggrandizement.

—The Modern Language Association had a very successful meeting to which interest was added by the presence of the two new occupants of our chairs of literature, Professors Alexander and Cappon, who promise to give fresh life to that study. A paper on Comparative Philology read by Mr. Chamberlain made us feel that since men who are now fifty went to school a new science has grown up and is bearing fruit not only for the historian but for the philosopher, the theologian, and all whose study is Man. With regard to the critical and scientific study of literature it was rather aptly remarked that the country in which English was studied least was that in which English literature had been produced. We are in some danger of making rules for seeing the glory of the sunset and smelling the sweetness of the rose. Alexandrian criticism came when Athenian production had departed. But there is a middle path which our professors will no doubt keep. As to style, we should almost despair of cultivating it by rule or system. To imitate the style of a great writer would be like imitating Jupiter's nod. All that most of us can do in the way of style, or ought to aim at doing, beyond grammatical correctness, is to know exactly what we mean to say, to say it, and have done with it. The best school of pure and graceful English is the

society of those who speak it, as the golden road to perfect mastery of Italian is to be born a Tuscan.

—Our new Professor of Moral Philosophy has given his inaugural and has proved, we believe we may say, to competent judges that he is master of his subject. He promises to connect philosophy with life. If he keeps his promise he will do what has been hardly done by any modern philosopher except the despised Paley. The others have devoted themselves to the quest of some sanction for morality other than the Will of the Author of our being and superior to experience which, as the debate still continues, they can scarcely be supposed to have found. Paley, who had no turn for metaphysical speculation, assumes at once that the sanction of morality is the Divine Will and proceeds to give practical rules of life. There is something of the same practical character in the lectures which Frederick Maurice gave as Professor of Moral Philosophy at Cambridge. Discovery in the region where the physical passes into the moral has completely changed the field and it is vain to suppose that a new professor can tread exactly in the footsteps of Professor Young.

—MR. FRANCIS E. ABBOT, who in the Boston *Unitarian Review* does us the honour to notice our criticism of Renan's Agnostic Manifesto, thinks that we have unconsciously thrown ourselves into the arms of Agnosticism by admitting that we can know nothing of infinity or eternity. We must frankly confess that if a knowledge of infinity or eternity were essential to religion and morality we should, so far as we can see, be reduced to Agnosticism. But the one thing needed, as it appears to us, to save us from Agnosticism, religious and moral, is a well-founded conviction that we are under the government of a Being whose character and objects are indicated by our moral nature, who will deal with us as we keep the moral law,

and who, through all the perplexities of this temporary scene, will in the end bring out moral good. Mr. Abbot quotes with sorrowful amazement our admission that nothing can be inferred from time as to eternity. "What," he asks, "is eternity but unlimited time? And how can either the presence or absence of limits in time change in any degree the nature of time itself?" Try, we would say in reply, to think of time without limit. Your mind will simply sink down under the effort. Eternity, as it appears to us, is the negative of all the characteristics and conditions of time. The "confluence of two eternities," each eternity limited by the point of time at which we start, of which Carlyle talks, is unthinkable. It is this notion that eternity is an extension of time which gives force to an Agnostic objection to the doctrine of the immortality of the soul. No white robes, no palm branches, no harps, can make the idea of time without limit other than one of insupportable weariness. We do not doubt of course that physical science tells us physical truth, but as it can only present things in space and time we do not see how it can give us a knowledge of infinity and eternity; nor do we see how, being merely the systematized report of our senses, it can give us the knowledge of anything supersensual. But we do not confine "Science" to physical science. Science is merely the Latin for knowledge, and if the indications of our moral nature are trustworthy they are just as much science as anything observed through the crucible or the telescope. It is rather important to bear this in mind, that physical science may not be invested with a false glamour at the expense of knowledge derived from other sources.

—The comparative longevity of animals is a subject which seems not to have received from science so much attention as it deserved, considering that an inquiry into it appears more likely than anything else to throw light on the nature of Life and Death. Darwin seems never to have taken it in

hand, though the phenomena which it comprises are apparently among the most curious and pregnant of Evolution. Dr. August Weismann, of Freiburg, takes it in hand in a series of essays, a translation of which has been published by the University of Oxford. We cannot attempt in our narrow space to summarize the scientific results. But they are somewhat melancholy for Man. For him, the crown, as he thinks, of creation, Nature seems to feel no special care. To man is allotted at most one century, to an elephant are allotted two. The longevity of birds is wonderful: ravens, parrots, eider ducks, eagles, vultures and wild geese reach a century. A falcon is said to have lived 162 years, and swans are said to have lived 300. It appears, according to Dr. Weismann, that Nature's ground of discrimination is purely physical and that she measures out life not by the dignity of the being or his capacities of development, but by the necessities of reproduction. A bird which lays only one egg in a year and is liable to having that one egg destroyed by a number of accidents, would not be able to keep up the race if it did not live long enough to lay a great many annual eggs; though why the bird lays only one egg remains to be explained, and the explanation seems to involve another Evolutionary process requiring almost unlimited time. We gather, too, the unconsolatory impression that if there is any care it is not for the individual, who is so dear to each of us, but only for the race. The removal of generations by death seems in like manner to be determined by the consideration that "the unending life of the Metazoan body would be a useless luxury," and that as the individuals would become damaged in course of time would be not only valueless but harmful to the species. Death is not universal: the lowest organisms do not die but propagate by fission. However, where biology with its centenarian geese and undying amoeba ends, moral philosophy begins. It cannot be contended that the moral and intellectual development of man has no object but reproduction or physical perfection. What physical purpose is served by poetry? By what physical process

can poetry have been evolved? Was reproduction Nature's aim in giving birth to Shakespeare?

—Mr. Bellamy, of "Looking Backward" fame, proclaims on the other side of the Line the death of domestic service and tells us we shall all have to take to co-operative house-keeping. He seems hardly to know how deep and far-reaching a change in our whole life the renunciation of separate homes would imply. The cause of the disturbance he, like us, takes to be "the democratic spirit of the age which has rendered and is rendering the relation of personal servitude unpopular. "Domestic Service," he says, "implies a sacrifice of personal dignity in the relation of the employee to the employer which at the present day is required of no other class of workers and would be endured by none." The consequence is a perpetual effort on the part of the servant girl to assert her dignity by mutiny. Masters and Mistresses, says Mr. Bellamy, exact of their servants a submissiveness and even obsequiousness of manner not required in any other relation. This is not true of the best masters and mistresses, who are as careful of the feelings of their domestics as they are of those of their guests. Why are subordination and respectfulness of manner more intolerable in a household than in a regiment or a ship? If household service were degrading a girl in service would be a degraded being. But is she so? If she is in a good family is she not rather raised by intercourse with a more highly educated class? Would not a sensible man just as soon take her as a factory girl for his wife? We are misinformed if the discipline of factories is not full as strict and full as rough as that of most households. The factory girl goes where she likes in the evening, but the real value of the privilege depends upon where she likes to go. In rural France a maidservant wears the dress of her order with as little sense of degradation as a soldier wears his uniform. On this democratic continent we are trying to live up to a Jeffersonian

ideal, according to which the worst of evils is subordination, though the sage himself so far stooped from the ideal to the practical as to hold slaves to the end of his life; like his Master Rousseau, who, having preached the most sublime doctrines of parental duty dropped his own infants into the basket at the Foundling Hospital. The trouble is, however, not confined to the New World. Carlyle believed himself to have ascertained that of the distressed needlewoman in London a good many were, in his phrase, "mutinous servant girls come to the net upshot of their anarchies." However, Mr. Bellamy has laid his finger on the sore point. Be very careful of the feelings and studious not to wound self-respect. This is good for both parties. Remember, too, that the restlessness of servants is caused in part at least by the restlessness of employers. The old English households to which we wistfully look back were the households of people who instead of crossing the ocean every year in search of pleasure and turning their domestics adrift staid at home and did their duty.

—Lord Lorne's muse has brought forth, under the title of "Love and Peril," the Canadian love story with which she was announced to be in labour. The story, we cannot help thinking, is a schoolboy production and not above schoolboy level in sense or taste. Allusions to the "bird cages" of the ladies of Toronto and to their dressing their hair over old sponges are not high-class wit. The political moral to which the story leads up through an account of the North-West rebellion is that Canada ought to have a standing army as well as a Governor-General's body-guard, a Royal Society, a Royal Academy, and the other paraphernalia with which Lord Lorne's genius endowed her. With all deference for the opinion of an ex-Governor-General we cannot think that the necessity for a standing army is proved by an insurrection which, whatever Lord Lorne may say, could put only five hundred men at most, and those very imperfectly armed, into the field. That

of which the North-West rebellion proved the necessity was a government with eyes and thoughts for something besides the working of the party machine. Nothing seems more certain than that with timely attention to the claims of the Half-breeds and timely lenitives applied to their simple fears, the rebellion might have been prevented and nine millions, besides many lives, saved to the country.

—Of Mr. Kingsford's "History of Canada" it may be said that it is an addition rather to the archives than to the literature of the country. It takes not so much the form of a narrative as that of a thorough and erudite investigation of a series of chapters in our early history. The last chapter dealt with in the last of the three volumes which have at present appeared is the Expulsion of the Acadians. The false and calumnious version of this affair has been made popular by the barley-sugar composition which is styled the poetry of Longfellow. Perhaps the moralists will some day give us, for the benefit of history, their opinion as to the proper limits of lying in verse. The episode, as Mr. Kingsford admits, is painful, but as he clearly proves is not disgraceful to Great Britain. The Acadians were not Arcadians, but very much the reverse, and they were under the influence of incendiary priests. In defiance of treaties they obstinately refused to come into British allegiance, or to abstain from hostile action against Great Britain. As Mr. Kingsford well puts it, they were a party in a besieged fortress conspiring and co-operating with the enemy against the garrison. There was nothing for it but to remove them, and this was done in as humane a way as possible, the only inhumanity shown being on the part of their own kinsmen at Quebec, who received such of them as having escaped deportation made for that Province with the coldest indifference and allowed them to starve. We owe to Sir Adams Archibald the first strenuous confutation of the false belief that England had committed in Acadia a second Massacre of

Glencoe ; but Mr. Kingsford's confirmation is the fruit of independent research. What would the Germans do with a people of a district in Alsace-Lorraine who now persisted in remaining in arms against Germany ?

—Few chapters in the unwritten history of Canada are more full of romance than those relating to the Fur Trade and the rivalries of the two great Companies. In M. Masson's *Les Bourgeois de la Compagnie du Nord-Ouest* (Toronto: Williamson & Co.) we have an account of one of the companies known as the "Nor'-Westers," whose headquarters were at Montreal. We learn a good deal, however, about the great English company of the "Hudson Bays," the area of its operations, and some of its hardy factors, who distinguished themselves by their explorations in the region long known, to geographers at least, under the name of Prince Rupert's Land. Amid the vicissitudes of nations this chartered company held the territory for two hundred years, until it passed to the British Crown and subsequently to the Canadian Dominion. Till the end of that period colonization knocked at the door in vain. For a hundred years the Hudson Bay Company did little to open up the country, contenting itself with establishing a few trading-posts on James Bay, to which the Indians of the Athabasca and Saskatchewan region resorted for trade. Meanwhile the great plains of the North-West had been explored by way of the Ottawa and Lake Superior, first by the adventurous French, and, after the conquest, by the equally adventurous Scotch of Montreal and Quebec. The result of this probing of the continent by the waterways of the St. Lawrence system was the speedy diversion of the peltry trade from the routes it had been wont to follow, and the awakening of the Hudson Bay Company to the active rivalry of the traders of Montreal. In 1784, the latter organized themselves into a trading corporation, known as the North-West Company, the history of which has now been given us by M. Masson. The

story told in his pages comprises the dramatic incidents in the career of the company, from its organization in 1784 to its amalgamation with the Hudson Bays in 1821. It is a story of almost continuous strife, peril and bloodshed. The ill-starred relations of Lord Selkirk and his Red River Colony with the Hudson Bays, and the long and bitter contest between the settlers and the wintering partners and employees of the North-West Company, are the chief incidents of the story. In narrating them, the author shows a manifest animus against the Hudson Bay Company and the philanthropic nobleman who sought to found a colony on the Red River. So partisan is M. Masson in dealing with this portion of his work, that the reader will have to seek elsewhere for the materials of a soberer judgment. The chapters dealing with exploration in the region we take to be more trustworthy, and they are certainly very entertaining. Pleasant also is the account given us of the magnates of the Montreal Company, and of the lordly hospitality in which they indulged at the annual gatherings of the partners at Fort William. Very welcome, to the wintering partners at least, must have been those times of cheer, for desolate indeed was the life of the early fur-traders in posts remote not only from civilization but from contact with their kind. Interesting matter will be found in the latter half of the book, which deals with Alexander Mackenzie's expeditions to the Arctic and the Pacific oceans, with Simon Fraser's voyage from the Rocky Mountains to the coast, with an exploratory tour with Captain (afterwards Sir John) Franklin, and with various trading ventures among the Missouri Indians. The author has derived the materials for these interesting narratives from the hitherto unpublished journals of servants of the fur companies. The work, as a whole, is a valuable addition to the literature of the North-West.

•

N.S., No. 6.

MARCH.

1890.

{ 10c. Single Number.
\$1.00 per year, post paid.

A MONTHLY
REVIEW

THE BYSTANDER

OF

CURRENT EVENTS,
CANADIAN AND GENERAL.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
The Loyalty Resolution.	173
The Young Liberals and Independence.	177
Imperial Federation in the Senate.	178
Whither Are We Tending?	179
The Dual Language Debate.	181
Mr. Charlton and the Exodus.	185
The Senate as a Political Reality.	185
The Rykert Letters.	186
The Banks and the Government.	187
Parties in Ontario.	191
Politics in Manitoba.	191
Report of the Parnell Commission.	192
The Times and its Enemies.	194
Opening of the British Parliament.	195
Industrial War in England.	198
European Monarchy.	199
Religious Movements.	201
Anglicanism and Rome.	203
The Papacy.	204
Death of Dr. Dollinger.	205
The Fire at University College.	206
Admission to Universities.	206

Toronto:

HUNTER, ROSE & COMPANY, 25 WELLINGTON ST.

PUBLISHERS.

Digitized by Google

WHOLESALE AGENTS:

TORONTO NEWS CO. TORONTO

MONTREAL NEWS CO. MONTREAL

JOS. M. SORLEY,

TELEPHONE 1398.

Real Estate Broker,

39 ADELAIDE ST. EAST.

I NVITES the attention of the public to call and examine his List of Properties, of which the following are specially recommended as being extra good investments :

The old BETHUNE PROPERTY on the North-east corner of John and Adelaide streets. This property has three frontages and will cut into 212 feet frontage. Am authorized to sell at specially low prices this month.

Bay Street, the future Toronto Street, 70x70; price \$700 per ft. Bay Street, North-east corner of Adelaide, 100x100. Bloor Street West, corner Brunswick Ave., 150 feet, at \$120 per foot. Madison Ave., 550 feet, at \$37.50 and \$40. Huron Street, 350 feet, at \$40 per ft. Walmer Road, 100 feet, at \$62.50 per ft. Admiral Road, 25 feet, at \$50 per ft. Dupont Street, 56 feet, at \$40 per ft. Brocton Addition. Block of 1035 feet on Boyce, Albert, Longfellow and Lappin Streets; Price, \$20 per ft. for this month. Cooper Ave., Brocton Addition, 232½ feet near Plough Works, at \$24 per ft. Mackenzie Ave., Brocton Addition, 240 feet near Bloor Street, at \$25 per ft. Yonge Street, North Toronto, 96 feet, at \$22 per ft. 150 feet, Gordon Ave., Rosedale, at \$45 per ft.

Readers of the BYSTANDER having property for sale should place them on my list early as I have numerous clients looking for good investments.

Loans Negotiated.

Investments Made.

Rents Collected.

JOS. M. SORLEY,

TELEPHONE 1398.

39 ADELAIDE ST. EAST.

A Connecticut Yankee

IN

King Arthur's Court,

BY

MARK TWAIN.

CLOTH EXTRA, - - - \$2.50

ROSE PUBLISHING COMPANY
TORONTO.

Digitized by Google

THE BYSTANDER.

MARCH, 1890.

THE breast of the American politician is probably united to that of the Canadian politician by a sympathetic chord which enables him to divine that the Canadian politician is sure to be always ready with a loyalty manifesto as he is himself always ready with a manifesto in favour of downtrodden Ireland or the Grand Army, and that the significance of the act in both cases is the same. It is not likely therefore that the effect of Mr. Mulock's Resolution on the minds of American politicians will be serious, or that either Mr. Hill or Mr. Butterworth will deem it necessary to alter his course in Congress in regard to Commercial Union. But on the mind of the American people the effect of an anti-continental Resolution passed with apparent unanimity by the Canadian Parliament can hardly fail to be bad, and it would be idle to deny that in this way the action of Mr. Mulock and his party may have done serious damage to the cause of improved trade relations. The consequences to their own position cannot be doubtful. This is the second occasion on which they have taken counsel with their enemies against their friends. The spirit miscalled loyalty to which they have appealed is that of hostility to closer relations of any kind with this continent, commercial as well as political, and it has answered their call with a vengeance. No wonder the Tory press is jubilant. No wonder Sir John Macdonald was ready to lend his helping hand in the concoction of the Resolution and to prune it of anything which might have made the gorge of some honest Liberal

rise and provoke him to move an Amendment. The game has been thrown by an act of shallow cunning or of panic into the hands of the Tory leader. He may now reject any overtures of Reciprocity with perfect impunity, and, having with genial courtesy assisted the Opposition to sharpen the razor with which it has cut its own throat, listen with calm complacency to its terrible criticism of his cab fares.

If the alarm on which the Resolution founded itself was genuine, it has had no parallel since Cowper's sheep determined to save themselves from the sound of the huntsman's horn by leaping into the pit. No creature in male attire surely can be such an old woman as to be really scared by "the plot." The plot, everyone with half an eye must have seen, was the device of a journal in financial extremities to ruin a rival whom it had no chance of beating in fair fight. The very fashion in which the revelation was presented, with flaring typography and sensation headings, was enough to warn the beholder of its real character. Mr. Hoar, as we have had occasion already to say, is a personage whose importance has been greatly overrated. But whatever may be the extent of his influence his object is not Annexation; it is merely the defeat of Commercial Union. He wants to protect the products of his constituents in New England against Canadian products, and he uses Annexation only as a lure to draw away support from Reciprocity. That he should have entered into a conspiracy with the Editor of the *Mail* for the forcible annexation of Canada and read the notes of his intercourse with his fellow-conspirator before a committee of the American Senate, only insane partisans can believe. There was at all events nothing to justify serious alarm and warrant the Opposition in flinging itself, as it has done, into the arms of the Government and wrecking its own cause.

The mover may very likely have had reasons of his own. More than once, though he is now so ecstatically loyal, he has voted sympathy with the "veiled rebellion," the object of which was to "break the last link which bound Ireland to Great

Britain," and deprive Her Majesty of her Irish crown. He has recently supported the Jesuit Act, by which the "robberies of George III. were repaired," and which introduced the Pope's name into legislation, to the manifest disparagement of the Crown. By the first of these strategical measures he conciliated the Irish, by the second the French and Catholic vote, but neither can have been pleasing to the loyal portion of his constituency, least of all to the Orangemen who are numerous in one section of North York. His loyalty Resolution trims the balance. The leader of the Opposition must wish to place his loyalty if possible beyond reproach, and to bury the recollection of his Rielism at a time when he is called upon to undertake the delicate task of defending against Equal Right the interests of the French and the Catholic priesthood. The same motive would have its influence with all the French and all the Catholics in the House. To enable Mr. Laurier to keep the Ultramontane vote, which after all he cannot keep, is really the paramount object of Opposition policy. Mr. Laurier calls himself a Liberal of the Liberals, and so in some other planet he may be, but here he is a Liberal supporting ecclesiastical ascendancy as well as French encroachment. His qualities as a speaker and as a gentleman are beyond dispute; but his leadership is very costly. Had the object been to find a feather bed on which the reputation of his ill-starred predecessor might fall softly a better choice could not have been made.

Though it can hardly have been the set purpose of Mr. Mulock and his friends, they may not have been disinclined to deal a blow at a critical juncture against the *Mail*, which for obvious reasons is equally odious to both Machines. To no one has the conduct of the *Mail* on the subject of Commercial Union been more obnoxious than to ourselves; in fact it was by the *Mail's* somersault on that question that THE BY-STANDER was called again into existence. But while the *Mail* must bear the consequence of its own levities as best it may, and defend itself as best it may against the competition of

other journals, whether self-sustaining or subsidized by the Government, the community cannot afford to see it crushed in the interest of the Machines. Alone it is independent of the Roman Catholic power; alone it is free from the electoral exigencies which constrain party organs to countenance Provincial raids on the Dominion treasury; alone it can be trusted to speak when party organs are kept silent by their fear of votes. From fear of advertisers it may not be free, but from fear of votes it is; and this is a great thing. If the *Mail* chooses to kill itself by folly or infidelity to principle nobody will mourn it, but we must not let it be killed. Above all we must not let it be killed by methods which would turn the Press into a scene of unbridled ruffianism and mutual butchery. Has nobody any remnant of regard for the honour and interest of the profession? We heartily congratulate the gentleman of the *Empire* who was discharged by the magistrate for want of evidence. Had he been proved to have acted as a spy on his fellow-journalist for the purpose of ruining a rival journal he would have borne an unsightly mark for the rest of his days. Even apart from the point of professional honour, a man had better let anything which is not very wicked or very dangerous pass than poison social confidence and stain his own character by playing the spy.

The spectacle of Liberals in the New World hypocritically grovelling before political fetiches, of which the Old World has almost grown ashamed, could hardly fail to produce a generous reaction in less politic breasts. The Young Liberals of Toronto and the National Club of Montreal, of course, have been compared to the three tailors of Tooley Street, but the record of the three tailors of Tooley Street as originators of great movements is by this time such that nobody need be ashamed of the comparison. The worst part of the survival of the old Grit Machine is that it is training up a generation of young Liberals in compromise, subterfuge and prevarication. No young man who has imbibed Liberal principles can sincerely believe that they sanction defence of religious privilege

or connivance at ecclesiastical domination ; and to begin public life by sacrificing principle to the exigencies of a Machine is to prepare for yourself a maturity of weakness and perhaps of shame.

The Young Liberals who met the Mulock Resolution with a counterblast appear to have in view Independence. That aspiration deserves our warmest sympathy, but those who cherish it must look at facts. Is there any hope of fusing British and French Canada into a nation ? Is there any hope of keeping permanently united, and at the same time separate from their continent, a string of territories, geographically divided from each other, commercially unconnected, and devoid of any natural boundary, either physical or ethnographical, such as now constitutes the Dominion ? When Mr. Blake set out to lead us to Independence, the French nationality of Quebec was not so strongly developed as it is now, nor had the fatal want of territorial compactness been brought so distinctly into view, the colonization of the North-West having then scarcely begun. Yet Mr. Blake's heart failed him and his flag was hauled down. Without a partnership of the heart, without identity of character, without community of aspiration, without anything at once to unite and to distinguish, is there any object in creating a separate community or any chance of its holding together when it has been created ? Ontario, as we have said before, might be a nation ; her population, saving the French encroachment in the East, is homogeneous and might well be raised to five millions ; her territory is sufficiently compact and its boundaries are tolerably well defined. Nor could there be any reason for fearing American aggression. But on the grander project nature seems to have set her ban. If, however, the Young Liberals and the National Club are bent on the experiment, their right course apparently is in the first instance to move for leave to Canada to elect her own Governor-General.

—Major Boulton is to be congratulated not only on having enhanced the picturesqueness of the Senate by his appearance in full uniform, but on having displayed a gallantry worthy of that uniform by presenting Imperial Federation for the first time in the form of a practical proposal. Hitherto it has floated before us as a nebulous entity, to which its devotees refused to give a definite shape; much less would they take a practical step of any kind, even when, as under Lord Beaconsfield, power was completely in their hands. But Major Boulton proposes to move in earnest. His plan is that Canada shall have representatives in both Houses of the British Parliament, with the privilege of voting on Canadian questions, and these alone. He is aware, no doubt, that this project is not new and that objections to it are already on record. Such a representation, it has been urged, while it would commit Canada to all Imperial entanglements and burdens would in reality be almost worthless. The representatives domiciled in England and brought under the political and social influence of the Imperial country would soon be more English than Canadian. Nor would it be possible to separate Canadian questions from the rest. The policy of every governing body must be an organic whole, the parts of which all more or less affect each other. A question about the boundary of British dominion in Africa or about the frontier of Afghanistan is not in itself Canadian; but it is Canadian if Canada would be drawn with Great Britain into the war. It is needless to enter into difficulties of detail, such as the awkwardness of the situation in which Canadian members of the Imperial Parliament would be placed if during their term the balance of parties should change here. Towards self-government, not towards centralization, the whole course of events has long been tending: that way points the genius of the race; and Major Boulton strives in vain to put back the shadow on the dial of history.

—Commercial Union was an attempt to give Canada the benefit of Continental Free Trade without political change. In the conduct of the movement by those who set it on foot this aim has been steadfastly kept in view, and all questions as to political relations with the United States have been scrupulously avoided, as well as all entanglements with Canadian parties. From the moment when party feeling was awakened, the Commercial Union meetings which had previously been numerous and successful were suspended, and the Club has confined itself to the circulation of its tracts which party could not touch. The political designs and intrigues which have been sedulously imputed to Commercial Unionists by the champions and organs of monopoly were slanderous figments and nothing else. Of that all who care for truth and justice may rest assured. Indeed, it is now plainly seen that Commercial Union, instead of being Annexation in disguise, is regarded by American Annexationists, who may be allowed to understand their own game, as destructive of the main inducement to political union, and is vehemently opposed by them on that account. It would certainly have tended to make the Canadian people content with existing institutions. That two neighbouring nations could not trade with each other without a sacrifice, on either part, of political independence is an assertion absurd in itself and confuted by the experience of commercial treaties, including the Reciprocity Treaty with the United States, to which our producers look back with wistful eyes. It is on a par, in point of sense, with the pretence that we should be selling our country because we sold our products, or that we should become hewers of wood and drawers of water for the Yankees by exporting our natural products and receiving their money or their goods in return. If the Mulock Resolution proves fatal to Commercial Union, or to Continental Free Trade, by whatever name it may be called, the end is sure. It is sure, and probably it is not very far off; for taxation has been carried to its limit, and there are no other means of replenishing the bribery fund by perpetual

drafts on which the fight against nature has been maintained, and the discontent engendered by commercial atrophy, especially in the Maritime Provinces, has been kept down. So assured appears the course of events that there would be as little use as there is pleasure in touching an angry question were it not that the earnings of the people are being squandered on such Separatist enterprises as the C. P. R., which, after receiving enormous subsidies as the pledge and bulwark of our distinct nationality, has become an American road and a potent addition to the commercial cords which bind us to the United States. The destiny which bears us onwards towards union with the rest of our race upon this Continent is no occult or mysterious power. It consists of attractive forces, geographical, ethnological and economical, the action of which is visible to all and is constantly increasing in intensity. The very struggle to defeat nature seconds her operation, by driving Canadians, through the impoverishment which it creates, out of Canada and thus promoting the fusion of the Canadian with the American people. There is moreover the growing desire to escape from French domination, which, if our politicians are hopelessly enthralled to the French vote, can be done only by a junction with the main body of our race. In the words endorsed by Lord Durham, Canadians begin to feel that "in order to remain English they may have to cease to be British." Nationality is a noble aspiration and it was well that destiny should be challenged on that subject, as she was by Canada First. It was well perhaps also that the alternative of Imperial Federation should be discussed and that we should see whether any intelligible and feasible plan of that kind could be framed. But to share with the rest of our race the work of founding an ampler and happier humanity on this broad Continent is no ignoble lot; it is a lot higher, surely, than perpetual dedication to a distant rule or to the cold ashes of an extinct feud. Certain it is, at all events, that willingness to entertain the idea of Political Union, if not positive desire for the change, has been spreading of late, even in the most unexpected

quarters, all official or Parliamentary displays of "loyalty" notwithstanding. Nothing but a bold organ and a resolute leader seems wanting to give the vague tendency the form of a pronounced movement and turn the whispered heresy into an avowed creed.

—Mr. Blake wades deeper and carries a section of his party further with him into his intrigue with Rielism, Ultramontanism and French Nationalism. An intrigue we are warranted in calling it, since the protest of his own judgment and conscience against his present course is on record in his London speech. It is waste of words to reason against arguments which, we know well, are not those of conviction, but those of the tactician constrained to devise some decent justification of the course which brings him votes. Nobody much cared to answer Mr. Blake's special pleas for the immunity of Riel, because nobody supposed Mr. Blake himself capable of believing either that a man who had just been conducting with no small skill a very difficult enterprise was insane in such a sense as to be irresponsible for his actions, or that the pretence of a political motive would justify any brigand in filling the community with blood and havoc. It would be equally superfluous on this occasion to answer the argument that by keeping up the annoyance and expense of a double political language we should attract settlement to the North-West. With the parallels alleged by Mr. Blake or his followers we have already dealt, and so, we presume, in their own minds have the speakers by whom they are brought forward. What analogy is there between the lingering existence of Erse in Ireland, of the tongue of the Cymry in Wales, of Gaelic in the Highlands of Scotland, of Breton in Brittany, or of Basque in Northern Spain, and the legislative intrusion, antecedent to settlement, of French as a political language into the North-West for the purposes of ecclesiastical propagandism? What light do the political necessities of a motley Empire like Austria, or of a

motley Confederation like Switzerland, throw on the present question? Where, as in the case of Austria, two or more nations are united under an Imperial Crown, the recognition of more than one political language is inevitable. In the case of Switzerland, as has already been said, the combination is immemorial, nor does the division of tongues correspond with the division of races or religions, since there are German-speaking and French-speaking Cantons of both creeds. Not that diversity of language is by any means helpful to national unity even in Switzerland, while in Austria it is an important factor in a division which keeps the Empire always on the verge of disruption. Cases of heterogeneous populations annexed by conquest, as Poland has been annexed by Russia, and Posen by Prussia, are evidently still less applicable as analogies to the present case, while as precedents nothing could be less auspicious. Mr. Mulock seems to have persuaded himself that unity of language is actually essential to the greatness of a nation. He must take a gloomy view of the prospects of Great Britain, since Gaelic is almost extinct in Scotland, Erse is rapidly becoming extinct in Ireland, and the language of the Cymry in Wales, though more tenacious, has since the introduction of railways been manifestly doomed. Mr. Blake and Mr. Mulock want the French vote, and at that shrine they sacrifice the plain interest of the North-West and their own moral allegiance as British citizens; that is the vital fact enfolded in all this oratorical buckram. They are at liberty to talk any nonsense which will serve the occasion, even such nonsense as the polyglot theory of national greatness, but they are not at liberty, nor is Mr. David Mills at liberty, falsely to impute odious sentiments and iniquitous aims to their opponents. They know perfectly well that Dr. Caven, Mr. McCarthy, and the other leaders of the Equal Rights movement, are as free from fanaticism and from persecuting tendencies as they are themselves. They know perfectly well that it has not been proposed or desired in any quarter to curtail the religious freedom of Roman Catholics, to subject them

to disabilities of any kind, to deprive them of any privilege enjoyed by other citizens, or to disparage their Church or creed. They know perfectly well that they would themselves, if the French and Catholic vote were out of the way, be foremost in protesting against Separate Schools, against tithe and fabrique imposts, against legislative propagation of a dual language for priestly purposes, against ecclesiastical domination in civil affairs. Equal Right, they are all aware, means Equal Right, and not the shadow of anything more. Government by the "solid Catholic vote" wielded by the priesthood, to which, as well as to legal privilege, Equal Right seeks to put an end, is not equality; it is the ascendancy of a sect maintained by disregard of civil duty. The tidings of the burning of the College buildings at Toronto reaching Ottawa in the middle of the debate, furnished Mr. Blake with an embellishment for his speech in the shape of an apostrophe to the university of toleration. Why is it a university of toleration? Because Anglican privilege, which once reigned there, has been abolished, and Equal Right has taken its place. Mr. Blake does not even want the hardihood to pretend that the Ultramontane and Nationalist movement in Quebec was caused by the counter-movement of resistance, which, by its excesses, it at length evoked. He will next tell us that the Equal Rights Association imported the Jesuits.

If there are any to whom, after Mr. Blake's alliance with the Rielites and his acceptance of service with the C.P.R., the catastrophe of his leadership is still an enigma, they may solve the mystery by studying his demeanour towards friends who happen to differ from him. Much has been said about want of magnetism as the cause of his failure; but some of the most trusted, the most successful, and even the most beloved of leaders, have been anything but magnetic. Pitt was not magnetic, nor was Grey or Peel, and Chatham was unapproachable. The real cause lies deeper. Mr. Charlton, it may be presumed, knew that the Hull police was under the Provincial, not the Dominion, Government. But everybody knows that if

the assailants of Miss Wright had not had the French vote looming behind them, the Dominion Government would have called on the Provincial authorities to stop a disgraceful riot at the door of the National Legislature. At all events, the head of the Government had said what there was to be said in defence of his own position, and the ex-Leader of the Opposition was not called upon to put himself forward for the purpose of striking a blow at an old friend. These ultra-Provincial Rights men are so earnest in the path to which they have been suddenly converted that we are reminded once more of the actor who blacked himself all over to play Othello. But their consistency is hardly on a par with their earnestness. They are too scrupulous to interpose when a woman is being stoned at their door, because it would be an interference with Provincial Police; yet they have no scruple in bringing the influence of Dominion patronage and Dominion influences of all kinds to bear upon Provincial elections. Sir John Macdonald, if we are not misinformed, is doing it with all his might at this moment.

The coalition of the Machines against Equal Rights is now complete, and they are emulously bidding against each other for the French and Catholic vote. But let the Opposition bid as it may, the gainer will be Sir John Macdonald, in whom the French and Catholics recognize their genuine friend, and who in allying himself with reactionary ecclesiasticism is at all events not outraging the principles of the Tory party. The Opposition leaders have already by their supercilious manner towards their dissident supporters, as well as by their equivocal acts, disorganized their party to an extent which may prove fatal at the next election. The first fruit of their demeanour and their policy is the Haldimand election. Mr. McCarthy, in the meantime, shows a gallant front to foes who assail him on every side. It is something, amidst all the fishing for votes and the political pusillanimity which that habit engenders, to see a man standing on his own feet and not afraid to stand alone.

—Mr. Charlton's proposal to inquire into the causes of the Exodus was of course voted down by the majority at the back of the Prime Minister. What signifies it that the flower of our population is leaving us, so long as Sir John Macdonald remains in power? The Prime Minister, however, gave one piece of information which threw a side-light on the subject. He admitted that the Oxford and New Glasgow Railway in Nova Scotia cost the country \$1,543,000, and that the distance saved by it was seven miles. Sir Charles Tupper had said that the saving would be forty-five miles, a very moderate embellishment on his part. The line was surveyed, it seems, to pass through Cumberland, then represented by Sir Charles himself, and Pictou, represented by his son. The million and a half are added to the general burdens of the people; and perhaps some scores of Canadian farmers pay by banishment from their homes the price of buying Nova Scotia for the Government, and securing the seats of Sir Charles Tupper and his son. Mr. Charlton reckons the number of Canadians in the United States to-day as 1,470,466, besides half a million of emigrants who have come into Canada and moved to the United States. Let it be borne in mind that these people are taken, for the most part, from the most active and enterprising portion of our population, and also that they leave us usually in youth or early manhood, when Canada has borne the cost of their bringing up. To compare to this exodus from the country the shifting of population between different parts of the United States is absurd. The United States do not lose their farmers or their citizens.

—We are told that the Senate shows a disposition to emerge from limbo and assert itself as a political reality. This might be very well if the Senate were a different body from what it is. On no part of the Constitution does the reproach weigh more heavily of having never received the sanction of the people; for it is scarcely conceivable that the people would

have willingly put their own necks under the yoke of a nominative Senate. If the vision of a genuine Senate, of an Upper House representing the worth, intelligence and influence of the country, in the principal lines and professions, or in connection with the great interests, floated before the mind of the political architect, not only has it never been realized, but no attempt to realize it has been made. The Senate is packed with the personal followers of the politician who has held power for the last twenty-five years. Three-fourths of them are the nominees and the political retainers of this one man, as to whose rule of appointment we have authentic information. "My Dear Pope,—I want you before we take any steps about John Young's appointment to see about the selection of our candidate for West Montreal. From all I can learn, William Workman would run the best. He will very likely object ; but, if he is the best man, you can easily hint to him that if he runs for West Montreal and carries it, we will consider that he has a claim to an early seat in the Senate. This is the great object of his ambition." For the writer of the well-known letter, of which this is an extract, the usual plea may be urged and partly admitted, that he has had to fight nature, and that nature can be fought only with bribes. But that which in some measure excuses the man does not save the character of the system or improve its fruits. "Sacrifices for the Conservative party"—in other words, contributions to the party election fund, are spoken of openly and without misgiving, as titles to a seat for life in the Legislature. We lift up our eyes and hands in holy horror at the profligacy of the times when seats in Parliament for English boroughs were bought in market overt. The old method of corruption may have been more gross, but was it more demoralizing than the new ?

—The *Globe* by a stern but most wholesome act of justice has saved the Senate and the country with it from at least one disgrace. Apart from the shameful disclosures which Mr. Rykert's letters contain of traffic in interest or pre-

tended interest with the Government, their very tone and the character self-portrayed in them are enough to show that the writer is fit to be made a baronet. Mr. Tupper, of Winnipeg, who is introduced as a helpmate by Mr. Rykert on the occasion, some time ago, it may be remembered, had a public quarrel with his partner who insisted that the sums received by Mr. Tupper for promoting the interests of clients at Ottawa should be brought into account with the firm. What that quarrel revealed Mr. Rykert's letters corroborate. Mr. Tupper's firm has flourished beneath the dew of Government patronage like a willow planted by the water-course, while disappointment and despondency have reigned around. And Mr. Tupper is heir to a baronetcy. So much for hereditary honours!

The remarkable thing is that in spite of a previous disclosure hardly less damaging than the present and of his general reputation Mr. Rykert is able to boast that he has retained the confidence or at least the suffrages of a constituency for twenty-five years. The respectable Conservatives of Lincoln County know what he is and confess that they know what he is, yet time after time they allow themselves against their sense of honour to be driven to the poll in his favour by the lash of party. In a debate in the American Senate the other day one Senator protested that he had nothing to say in favour of non-partisan legislation. He believed, he said, "in the most partisan legislation, Republicans for Republicans, Democrats for Democrats." To this a Senator on the other side responded "Aye and Amen: I believe in partisanship. I wish every citizen in the State were a bitter partisan of some kind or other." It is pleasant to see men frankly embrace the consequences of their theories. Nor can there be any doubt that the theory is most useful to politicians whose aim in public life is a share of the Government timber limits. But is this our political ideal?

—Our commercial morality, notwithstanding the inevitable percentage of roguery, is sound; our political morality is

almost a jest. It would seem unwise therefore to transfer the regulation of the machinery of credit, which is the very life of our commerce, from commercial to political hands. Yet this is what they advocate who propose to take the power of issuing the bank bills from the Banks and give it to the Government.

Two things these reformers say they want—a national currency and a safe currency. They already have both in as large a measure as circumstances will permit. The bills of our leading banks circulate all over the Dominion at par. If hitherto the bills of the remoter Provinces have not passed at par in Toronto, this is one of the many things incident to the looseness of the Federation and the dislocation of its territory; and the Banks propose to obviate it by special arrangement. That the currency is safe is proved by the fact that the bills are taken everywhere and by everyone without the slightest hesitation or misgiving. Well they may be. For a few days the bills of the Central Bank were at a slight discount, after which they were taken up in full. The notes of the Maritime Bank were paid only after a long interval. But at last they were paid, and they would have been paid sooner had not Government laid its hands on the deposits in the name of the prerogative of the Crown. No other loss or shadow of loss has fallen on the holders of British Canadian Bank bills since the inauguration of our present system, while the Government paper of the United States has been at fifty per cent. discount, and that of more than one European monarchy has been heavily depreciated, to say nothing of South American Republics or Hayti. The bills are the first charge on the assets; we have the security of the double liability; and to make that security doubly sure the Banks are now ready to form a mutual guarantee fund for the protection of bill holders against any possible loss.

The fact is, however, that neither of the pretended motives is the real motive. The real motive is a desire to appropriate the gains of the Banks, or at least to make them engines for

artificially raising the value of Government securities and thus in effect levying forced loans upon the people. The idea that Government is entitled to the gains of the Banking trade or to meddle with the Banking trade more than with other trades, arises from what may almost be called a verbal fallacy. It is the duty of a Government to stamp the coin in order to assure us of its weight and fineness, and this duty Governments, after a long course of fraudulent debasement, have at last been drilled into doing with integrity. Coin is called money; bank-bills, because they circulate like coin, are called money; and the idea prevails that all money is the province of the Government. But bank-bills are not money: they are instruments of credit, like promissory notes, bills of exchange, or drafts. As often as they change hands gold passes, just as it does in the case of a cheque at the bank of issue from the credit of the giver to that of the taker. Their issue and circulation, like that of other instruments of credit, ought to expand and contract with the necessities of commerce and will do so as long as the function of issuing them is left with the banks, which are the organs of commerce and the indicators of its requirements. When an honest Government undertakes to meddle with the circulation of bank-bills the result appears in the history of Peel's Bank Charter which has had to be suspended as often as the crisis for which it was provided has arisen. When a dishonest Government undertakes to meddle, the result is such as that which led Tom Paine after an experience of inconvertible paper to demand, in right earnest, that death should be the penalty of any proposal to return to the system. There are governments which are half honest; and these try to use the banks as engines for putting a forced value on Government securities, levying thereby, in effect, as has already been said, a forced loan upon the nation. Bank-bills must usually be taken like coin without examination. It is therefore right that to guard the public against fraud banks should be subject to inspection and should be required to hold a reserve. This is the sole ground of Government interference

with the banking trade, which is just as much a department of commerce as any other trade; nor ought the funds of trade to be unduly locked up under colour of enforcing a reserve. That nationality and security are not the only aims of the Government at Ottawa is shown by its proposal to lay hands upon the deposits when they have been for a certain period in the hands of the Banks. Government has no right whatever to these funds and might as well put its hands into a till.

The cupidity of Governments is probably excited by the American system which puts a forced value on Government bonds by making them the basis of bank circulation. But the American system is now approaching a catastrophe. When the public debt is paid and the Government bonds are withdrawn a new basis will have to be found. The Canadian system shows its superiority by extending its operations largely beyond the Line.

In any raid upon the Bank circulation, Government would have the sympathy of industrial destructives who are jealous of the gains of the Banks and of those of all other commercial corporations, as though it were possible for trade to be carried on without profit or for industry to prosper without trade. It will also have the sympathy of socialistic speculators who are glad to see any power grasped by Government because they think that the power of Government will some day pass into their own hands and be wielded by them for their own objects, as that of issuing paper currency would with a vengeance. But those who know that the Banks are the vital organs of commerce will look with jealousy on any tendency to draw them into the political vortex, and place them, possibly, at the mercy of spendthrift and rapacious governments. The governments themselves, if they understood their own interests, would see that by deranging or crippling commerce and thus preventing the growth of wealth, they would be drying up the sources of their own revenues in the long run. Wisdom and probity, things inseparable from each other, let us hope will pre-

vail and prevail without delay, for commerce cannot afford uncertainty and suspense.

—While confusion reigns at Ottawa, in Ontario parties appear to be defining themselves afresh on a Provincial basis. It is plain that Mr. Mowat will take the field as the opponent of Equal Right and will receive the solid Catholic vote, by which we mean not the votes of all Catholics, for some Catholics are at heart Liberal and opposed to clerical domination, but all the votes that are at the command of the clergy. He will also receive the solid French vote from the East and West sections of the Province. Archbishop Cleary has sounded the trumpet call to which the armies of the faithful will respond. Thus Mr. Mowat's antagonist, even if he were not led by inclination, would be almost borne by the tide of war into a position in which he will appear as the champion of religious equality and of British and Protestant right. The practical question is whether Mr. Meredith will be able sufficiently to disentangle himself from his fatal connection with Ottawa to play his part freely and with effect. What is certain is that he has no other part to play, and that if he allows the managers of an Ottawa party to damp the spirit of his councils and force upon him Machine nominations, as they are now doing, he might as well leave the field. Ottawa cares little for him: it does not want him to win: it wants him to keep things quiet for it here and prevent Ontario resisting "Better Terms" when they are demanded by Quebec and the smaller Provinces. He can hardly fail to see this or to know that he has reached the point at which a choice must be made.

—In the meantime Manitoba will not be "checked." She rejects by an overwhelming vote the blessings of dualism tendered her by Mr. Blake, and her decision will draw with it that of the Territories. In that quarter, at all events, a vigorous initiative shows itself, and it is possible that even a

leader will appear. In Dominion politics Manitoba is a cipher, or worse; remote from Ottawa, and without men of sufficient standing and sufficient leisure to send thither, she tamely allows her representation to be jobbed by the Ottawa Government, and members to be nominated by its influence, who betray the general interest and her own. But her Provincial Legislature, filled with the best men she has, is independent and patriotic. She is to be congratulated on the failure of an attempt just made to suppress public opinion in Winnipeg by buying *The Sun*, the only independent journal, and reducing the Press to a single organ in the hands of a combination, the physiognomy of which is not very distinct, but appears to blend the features of the C.P.R. and the Hudson's Bay Railway with those of the Ottawa Government and the Ultramontane party. The attempt to reduce the Press of a free community to a literary satrapy was not very likely to succeed. At all events, it has not succeeded. The *Winnipeg Tribune* steps, as an independent and patriotic journal, amidst much cheering, into the place left by the sinister absorption of *The Sun*. We note with pleasure Mr. Greenway's contradiction of the reports as to dissensions between Attorney-General Martin and himself. Mr. Greenway's Government may have its faults; but it is the most patriotic, the most economical, the strongest and best Government that Manitoba has yet had; and those who care more for the material interest of the Province than for faction, cabal, or any desperate railway enterprise, will make a great mistake if they do not give Mr. Greenway and his colleagues a fair trial.

—The gradual severance of Canada from the Motherland is in nothing more marked than in the growing indifference of Canadians to British politics. Formerly the news from "home" was awaited with eagerness, was devoured with absorbing interest and furnished the text for endless comment.

Now the opening of the British Parliament, big with the fate of the Mother Country as the day is, hardly inspires a single editorial.

The Parnell Commission was, as we have steadfastly maintained, a mistake from the beginning. If *The Times* had libelled Parnell, Parnell and his crew had ten times more savagely libelled every member of Parliament and every Minister of the Crown who had been concerned with the repression of crime in Ireland. Both sides ought to have been left to the ordinary tribunals, which were disparaged as well as ousted by the obtrusion of this extraordinary inquest. It was little likely that the convictions or feelings of infuriated faction would be swayed by any judicial verdict, even though it had been delivered by Minos, Æacus and Rhadamanthus instead of Judges Hannen, Day and Smith. We may safely say that had the Pigott Letters proved to be genuine instead of forgeries the language of Mr. Gladstone and his followers about Mr. Parnell would have been little changed by the discovery. It was inevitable that the Government should be regarded, however unjustly, as the prosecutor of its political enemy, and should thus be involved in the chances of a failure, especially when it was ill-advised enough to allow the Attorney-General to appear. The inquiry moreover, when entrusted to legal hands, to be conducted under legal conditions, became in its own nature almost desperate, since the evidence required was legal, whereas the proof of connection between the head of a party and their followers must generally be not legal but moral, however certain the connection may be. The future historian, sweeping aside questions as to the authenticity of a particular letter or as to the formal proof of complicity between those who were acting together for the same end, will point to the broad and decisive facts. During the whole of this reign of crime and outrage in Ireland, Mr. Parnell and his colleagues have been completely masters of the three Provinces over which it prevailed; they have nominated the members for every constituency; they have had in their hands every

organ of opinion; whatever they have seriously enjoined the people to do has been done. Had they chosen really to put forth their force, they might at any time have bid crime and outrage cease. But it was to the reign of terror produced by crime and outrage that their own power owed its existence. Therefore not only did they not bid crime and outrage cease, they virtually bade them go on by palliating them, by inflaming the passions which were sure to give birth to them, by traducing and denouncing every agent of government and minister of law who in the execution of his duty was concerned in putting them down. Will anyone hereafter believe that the proprietors of the *United Ireland*, a list which is understood to include Mr. Justin McCarthy among other Mr. Parnellites, were not morally more guilty of the acts to which that journal has incited its readers than the ignorant and hungry peasants by whose hands the acts were done?

That Mr. Parnell should come off personally triumphant after the proof that the Pigott Letters were forged was a foregone conclusion. On the other hand, legal proof has been furnished of the connection between the Parnellite organizations and the murder clubs of the United States. This will not prevent Mr. Gladstone and the Home Rulers from accepting in the next election the aid of the Parnellite organizations, with funds drawn from the American murder clubs, for the dismemberment of the United Kingdom.

—Perhaps the most serious part of the matter is the discredit cast upon an authority so closely identified with the Unionist cause as the *London Times*. That *The Times* knew the Pigott Letters to be forgeries, and even was concerned in the fabrication, is a calumny too gross for anyone but Mr. William O'Brien to utter or for any sane being to believe. *The Times* erred and erred terribly in accepting anything tendered it by one of the class of disreputable adventurers

which is always called into sinister activity by Irish disturbance. But its integrity, the purity of its motives, the patriotism which has led it to risk its great name and pour forth its wealth like water for the preservation of the Union can never be called in question. Its power is attested by the fury with which it is attacked by the political leaders of the Radical Party. Such a war waged by a great combination of public men and Parliamentary factions against a journal has, we believe, no parallel in political history. Some of the present assailants are "Dugald Dalgettys" now in the Irish service, who once were proud to see their names in *The Times*. Every advantage that Parliamentary privilege can afford is taken without scruple against an unprivileged journal, the property of private individuals, and the assailants plainly show that their object is not to purge the character of Parliament or do justice to an injured reputation but to ruin a dreaded and hated power. If the country finally escapes from the mortal peril into which, by an alliance of domestic faction with the foreign enemies of England, it has been brought, great will be the debt of gratitude that it will owe, and in a happier hour will pay, to the proprietors and managers of *The Times*.

—The struggle between parties in England is morally a civil war. No passions which an actual civil war could excite would be more virulent or more unpatriotic; nor could the sword and petronel of Cavalier or Roundhead be weapons of a hatred more deadly than that which expresses itself in slanderous declamation or among savages, like some of the low Parnellite journalists, in libels still more vile. In truth it is doubtful whether the country could be effectually delivered from its present peril by any leader who was not prepared to face the risk of civil war. Scarcely without such daring could the measures be passed which even at this eleventh hour might redress the balance of the Constitution and place British progress beyond the reach of Radical and Socialistic revolution.

But Lord Salisbury is a grandee of whom nothing heroic is to be expected, especially when he is depressed by ill health, nor has he given political problems thought enough to be prepared with an organic solution. He tries to keep the nation on his side by the ordinary appeals to its confidence in the way of skilful diplomacy and sound finance, forgetting perhaps, or not distinctly seeing, that he has to deal with masses who know not what diplomacy means and care little even about finance. His policy is one of concession by which he hopes to head off revolution and especially to save the hereditary House of Lords, the paramount object of his love and care. Like some other Conservative statesmen, he seems to think that he can cure Socialism by vaccination, and talks of improving the dwelling houses of the poor out of the public taxes, an operation which must be very limited, unless enormous expense is to be incurred, and like all alms-giving on a large scale and of a promiscuous kind may eventually do as much harm as good. Aristocracy and almsgiving are in fact Lord Salisbury's domestic policy. He is a man of great ability; he has able men at his side; and perhaps he may succeed.

The story goes that Mr. Balfour in reply to the taunt that he was not likely to succeed in solving the Irish problem when Cromwell had failed, replied that he intended, like Cromwell, to be rigorous in his repression, but unlike Cromwell to be an improver at the same time. If he did say this he knows little about Cromwell, who was the one genuine improver that ever appeared on that unhappy field, and of whose improvements what is soundest and best in Ireland remains the monument. One scheme in which he is himself to appear as the Cromwell of beneficence is foreshadowed as an extension to Ireland of the British Local Government Act. If experience is to be heard it will proclaim that a greater curse could hardly be inflicted on that country than a measure, styled of self-government, which would cover it with local Tammanies. Home Rule for a time at least the three Celtic Provinces do really want, but it is the Home Rule of a Government, such as that of the Pro-

lector, so far as he had real power, was, strong, enlightened and just. Demagogism is the bane of the island, and what can a Local Government Act do but increase it, especially in the present mood of the Irish, which ought to be taken into account in granting new powers as much as the abstract merits of the arrangement itself? To "raise more hogs and less hell," as the outspoken Texan says, is what the peasantry of Ireland need. Under every sort of régime, under their native chiefs, their native kings, their native priesthood, under Tudor autocracy and Stuart Parliaments, under the Catholic Parliament of Tyrconnell, under Grattan's Parliament, under the Parliament of the United Kingdom, and not at home only but in the United States and in the Colonies, the Irish, led by successive swarms of agitators and fed with political firewater, have been "raising hell" for about two thousand years. A firm, upright and kindly rule, under which they would be allowed to "raise hogs" is the thing that, if left to themselves, they probably would welcome. Unhappily it is the thing which faction is least likely to allow them to have.

The Partick (Lanark) election augurs well for the Unionists, whose vote has increased, while their majority has not been reduced more than it was sure to be after the loss of so strong a standard-bearer as the late Unionist member, Craig Sellar. But we cannot tell from these bye-elections what will happen when at a general election the floodgates of party are opened and local or personal influences are drowned in the flood. Unless at the very brink of the descent a strong arm should interpose or a preserving angel descend from heaven, no human being can say what, three years hence, will become of England. If we did not know what faction has done from the days of the Siege of Jerusalem to our own, it would seem incredible that, with Socialistic revolution at the gates, a section of the Tory party should think of nothing but its own narrow interests or prejudices, and be doing its utmost to prevent the junction with the Liberal Unionists, without which an anti-revolutionary majority cannot be secured.

—The political danger in England is greatly enhanced by industrial disturbance which fills all breasts with an anxiety too well founded. It is true that the Strikes are largely the work of professional agitators, such as Mr. Burns, whose trade is industrial war. These men actually constrained a body of artisans to reject an arrangement, the reasonableness and liberality of which they could not deny, because it would prevent them from calling the men out on strike. But the material must be combustible or the match would be applied in vain. The relation between the employers of labour and the labourers is becoming full of danger in all countries, but especially in England, where the industrial disturbance among the artisans is closely connected with their fresh possession of the suffrage and the movement of political revolution. Political reformers in England have failed to observe that universal suffrage is far more perilous in a land of factory operatives and hired labourers than in one of peasant freeholders. The industrial antagonism is sharpened and embittered by social separation which has been enhanced since the mill-owners have altogether ceased to live near their mills and among their men. Nor does any remedy yet appear. The plans for turning the artisan from a mere wage-earner into a partner do not make much way: those cannot share the profit who would not consent to share the loss, nor can the helm of commercial enterprise be confided to the democracy of the Mill. In Mr. Donisthorpe's "Individualism a System of Politics," a book full of ingenious speculation and criticism in a lively form, it is proposed to solve the difficulty by "capitalizing" labour according to a scale which the writer suggests. But capital is a tangible reality; labour is not a tangible reality; the only tangible reality is the labourer; and how can the labourer be capitalized? Meantime, labour journals are daily instilling venom into the heart of the "toiler" and leading him to regard all employers and all above him in wealth as his "spoilers" and his foes.

All these strikes make the case worse not only by the waste which they occasion but by stimulating invention to supply the

place of men who mutiny by machinery which does not. The late Mr. Cotter Morison, in "The Service of Man," has an apocalyptic vision of the coming time when the productive powers of machinery will be such as to throw myriads of artisans out of work. It does seem as if we must be drawing towards some crisis of that kind, at least if the artisan class continues to multiply without restraint. History is like the German Pass, where at every step the path seems barred by impassable rock, but still opens out again as the wayfarer advances. Some exit from this dilemma, hope whispers, will be found. But the relation between the employer and the wage-earner is at present the great peril of civilization. Panacea, it is to be feared, there is none: palliatives there may be. Something, at all events, may be done to bridge the social chasm and mitigate the bitterness of class-feeling.

—Dom Pedro of Brazil had shut himself up in the cell of science almost as completely as Duke Prospero, and had preserved so little of Imperial state that when he was visiting Quebec he owed to a gentleman of this city a rescue from an extortionate cab-driver. The deposition of such an Emperor without apparent violence and with a handsome indemnity did not appear likely to shake the world. Yet through some singular coincidence it bids fair to make an epoch. The throne of the House of Braganza in Portugal itself evidently totters. In Spain Royalty is a sickly babe in a cradle rocked by a female Regent. The fall of the Brazilian offset of the Portuguese dynasty has given an impulse to the republican movement in both countries, while the narrow escape of the Spanish infant from death impresses upon the people the irrationality and the instability of a system which entwines public order and the national welfare with the frail thread of an individual life. Just at this juncture come the buccaneering exploits of Serpa Pinto in Africa, the quarrel with England, the childish frenzy of Portuguese passion and the erection of the adventurer

into a national hero, while the efforts of the government to avert a preposterous war bring it into sharp collision with republican patriotism. When Serpa Pinto returns it is not unlikely that he may head a revolution in Portugal and that the convulsion may extend to Spain. It is possible even that the union of the Peninsula, which seems to be decreed by nature, but which miscarried in the maladroit hands of Spanish despotism, may now be brought about under the form of an Iberian Republic on a federal footing. Federation would well suit Spain where, beside the passionate love of union, religious and dynastic, there has always been a strong Provincial life in each of the old Kingdoms or Principalities of which the monarchy was composed.

The event has at all events set people speculating on the future of Monarchy even in England. English Monarchy, having entirely ceased to reign, or even freely to appoint its own waiting-women, was strong in its weakness so long as it continued to perform its social duties. Those duties, however, for the last quarter of a century it has, whether from distaste or parsimony, neglected to perform; and in the case of Ireland, where the hearts of the people yearn for personal chieftaincy, with most disastrous consequences to the nation. Radicalism, by the mouth of Mr. John Morley, protests that while it is determined to "mend or end" the House of Lords it does not aim at the abolition of the Monarchy. But when the House of Lords and the Established Church were gone and had carried with them to the grave the hereditary principle and religious reverence for the past, the life of a dynasty, stripped of all power and left amidst alien surroundings, would not be long. The people already, in spite of the abundance of the national wealth, grudge the Crown the allowances necessary to maintain its state and preserve the sacred exclusiveness of the Royal Family. Each Royal grant is the signal for an outburst of popular discontent, accompanied with ominous demonstrations of irreverence. Royalty is constrained to intermarry with wealthy subjects and perhaps will presently

be brought down to the American heiress. Then will come social entanglements, jealousies, and perhaps scandals, which will finally break the spell. A crisis may even be near at hand. The Prince of Wales is very popular. But it has long been whispered that the chances were against his surviving his mother, and it is perfectly evident that he could not bequeath his popularity or influence of any kind to his youthful son. The barque of "Cuffs and Collars" would not long ride in safety the stormy waters of Radical and Socialistic Revolution. Like the Papacy the British Monarchy retains prestige in proportion to the distance from its centre. People here have no notion of the irreverence with which it is treated by the popular press and by the masses in England.

—Presbyterianism in the United States seems inclined to venture on Revision, and even to think of reducing dogmatic formularies to a simple creed, such as might be accepted by all Christians. This surely would be an alarming undertaking. Touch the tissue of dogmatic theology and the whole web will be unravelled. First will go the Protestant Scholasticism of which Justification by Faith and Predestination, the controversial reaction against Indulgences crystallized into a creed, are the leading dogmas. Then will go the Scholasticism of the Middle Ages which did not fail to transmit some of its influence to its Protestant successor. Then Roman legalism. Then Byzantine and Alexandrine theosophy. At last the reviser would come to the body of dogma framed by construing literally and turning into articles of faith the Mosaic and Rabbinical figures and metaphors of St. Paul. Perhaps it would be necessary to eliminate even the influence of poets such as Dante, whose pictures of the eternal torture-house present Deity as an Italian tyrant, and Milton, with whose poetry a good deal of dogma steals into the mind. When the process was completed there would hardly be left anything but "Thou hast the words of Eternal Life." The words of Christ as the rule of life and

his character as the pattern still unite all his disciples as they united all who heard him on the hill-sides of Galilee. It would be difficult to find or devise any ecclesiastical creed or article of a creed which would find universal acceptance. Would it not then be wise to be satisfied with practical communion and, without formal abrogation or revision, lay the formularies aside, or at least cease to impose them on conscience, and allow them to stand for whatever as doctrine or history they are worth? The Westminster Confession contains passages which breathe the spirit of the militant Covenanter, and which as descriptions of the God of Justice and Mercy cannot be read without a shudder. Yet it is a noble and solemn monument of the religious reason, reverently and at the same time boldly addressing itself to the great problems of human existence and of the relation between God and man. It has helped greatly to form a high, albeit somewhat stern religious character, and in this respect its usefulness has not ceased.

In England it seems that secessions to Rome have become more numerous again, chiefly, as might be expected, among the clergy. Among the laity the seceders are mostly of the wealthier and more aristocratic class, where speculative disquietude, historic and fancy and æsthetic influence have their place; between the mind of the peasant or artisan and the religion of the Middle Ages the link is broken forever. Personal influence or alms may make converts to the ancient faith among the poor, but few will be made by the reasonings of Bellarmine and Bossuet or by the talisman of Gothic art. That more of the High Church clergy of England have not already gone over is to be ascribed in some measure to the influence of benefices, by which we mean not pay alone but parish interests, and still more perhaps to marriage. Thirty years ago Dr. Pusey avowed in his *Eirenicon* that the only two insurmountable obstacles to union with Rome in his mind were the excessive exaltation of the Pope and the excessive adoration of the Virgin; questions, both of them, merely of

degree. Those who witnessed the Tractarian movement, at all events, can have no difficulty in understanding the attraction of a sacerdotal Church for the clerical mind, of an "august and fascinating superstition," as Macaulay calls Roman Catholicism, for the emotional mind, or of infallibility for the mind which is a prey to religious doubt and has not satisfied itself that there can be no real safety outside allegiance to the God of Truth, nor any real danger within it.

We seem to have made some clergyman angry by saying that the Mass must either be a miracle or an imposture. Yet surely this is the fact, and if it is a fact it is a serious consideration for anyone who is inclined to dally with the question. Against serious belief in the miracle we have not a word to say. The distinction between the most solemn celebration of the Communion and the Mass seems plain. Wherever there is adoration of the elements, by genuflection before them, by elevation of them, or in any other way, apparently the rite celebrated is not the Communion but the Mass.

Archdeacon Farrar's proposal to restore monasticism in the Anglican Church seems to have fallen to the ground. He perhaps intended it as a counter-charm to the charm of Roman Catholicism which he saw working again around him with renewed power. There is no reason why we should not use anything good however it may have been abused. A brotherhood may be a good thing, still more may be a sisterhood, provided always that there is no vow, no asceticism, no superstition. For women who do not marry and have no strong domestic or social ties, a sisterhood with a share in some useful work can hardly fail to be better than a lonely and aimless life. But monasticism of the Roman Catholic type has surely been condemned by decisive experience. It has just been attempted by a laborious and we must say fairly judicial writer to whitewash English monasticism and reverse the verdict of the Commissioners of Henry VIII. To show that the Commissioners were the agents of a rapacious government and that their verdict was very far from

judicial, is easy, but their general finding is confirmed by the state of the monasteries in Italy and other countries. It is certain, at all events, that the wings of superhuman aspiration having long become weary, the monasteries had sunk into idleness and torpor, if not into worse vice. The people over the greater part of the country saw their dissolution certainly without sorrow and probably with joy. In Italy the other day a great dissolution or reduction of monasteries took place. Not a finger was raised in resistance, not a sigh was breathed. The monks, so far as we could learn, were glad to throw off the cowl and return to home and social life. In Spain when the great monastery of Poblet was dissolved the monks had literally to run for their lives from the vengeance of the peasantry. The Order of Loyola is still full of life; but the life is intrigue, not asceticism or contemplation. It is possible to conceive a state of things in which brotherhoods might regain a beneficent force and contend with social evils and distractions, as the monks of early days contended with barbarism and the wilderness. But surely we have done with the cowl.

—Those who wish us to believe that the Papacy in the nineteenth century has changed its nature, and that we need feel no fear of its encroachment on the civil power, should get the Pope to hold his tongue. This, so far as his own disposition is concerned, the wearer of the purple crown would not be sorry to do. The late Pope was a Papal guardsman turned into a supplement to the Deity, and he behaved as such a personage might be expected to behave. But Leo XIII. is by nature, and showed himself at the beginning of his reign, a cool-headed, moderate and statesmanlike Italian, willing to live on quiet terms with the civil power. He made the philosophic Newman a Cardinal and seemed to prefer the medievalist Aquinas as a text-book to the Jesuit Suarez. But he is in the hands of the Sons of Loyola, who constrain him to ratify the Encyclical. "If the laws of the State," he says,

"are in open contradiction to the Divine Law, if they command anything prejudicial to the Church or hostile to the duties imposed by religion, or violate in the person of the Supreme Pontiff the authority of Jesus Christ, then indeed it is a duty to resist them and a crime to obey them, a crime fraught with injury to the State itself, for every offence against religion recoils on the State. To love the two fatherlands, the earthly and the heavenly, but in such a manner that the love of the heavenly prevails over that of the other, and that human laws are not preferred to the law of God, such is the essential duty of Christians, from which spring, as from their source, all other duties." When the theological froth is blown away, the meaning is that the ecclesiastical power is above the civil power, and that when the commands of the two conflict the ecclesiastical power must be obeyed. Hildebrand and Innocent III. could want nothing more; neither of them professed insatiable ambition; they only upheld as divine the principle by which insatiable ambition was warranted. Is it intolerance to demur to such pretensions? Are not they who call it intolerance using the pretence of superior intolerance as a cloak for the betrayal of one of the great organic principles of modern civilization?

—If after the Reformation any Teutons remained Roman Catholics it was through accident or pressure; accident such as the isolation of the Mountain Cantons of Switzerland, or pressure such as that of the House of Austria on its German dominions, or that of France on the Palatinate. Dollinger belonged to the land and race of Luther. But, like Erasmus, though in a far more earnest spirit, he sought to reform the vast structure of medieval superstition without fundamental change. The attempt was hopeless and the Old Catholic movement is buried in the great scholar's grave. But we must not think that the life of a man who has tried a path for us is wasted because the experiment fails. It is only by try-

ing all things that our fallibility learns to what we are to hold fast as good. Dollinger with his piety, his learning, his self-devotion, his great personal ascendancy has made it evident that the Church of Rome cannot be reformed. Reason and morality in his person have tried to make terms with Ultramontaniam and Jesuitism and have tried in vain.

—The beauty of University College as a pile, set off by its site, was unquestionable; and its temporary destruction is a public sorrow. But the style was false. The heaviness of Norman architecture belonged to a period before the architect had gained confidence in his materials and can be redeemed only by the majesty of prodigious massiveness, as it is in Durham Cathedral. The style was not unsuitable for a Church which required only a "dim religious light," the eyes of all the worshippers being fixed on the lamp hung over the Host, and it was perfectly suitable for a Norman keep which required no light at all. But it was not well-suited for domestic purposes or for the lecture-rooms and halls of a University. The decorative carvings, in like manner, belonged to the infancy of art, of which they were a factitious reproduction: an artist of the thirteenth or fourteenth centuries would have looked upon them with disdain. The general structure was ill-adapted to a climate with a heavy snow-fall, and the internal arrangements were inconvenient. In this last respect it may be hoped that the reconstruction will be an improvement. The Phoenix will rise in due course more glorious from its ashes and it will learn henceforth to provide proper hydrants and insure to the requisite amount. In laying down the principles of public action in the matter it ought not to be forgotten that all the chartered universities stand, as they maintain, in the same relation to the State.

—If the plan of granting to pupils on leaving the High Schools certificates of fitness for admission to the University

is to be adopted, we hope it will not be thought cruel to insist that the test shall be severe. A University education is a very good thing for such as can really turn it to account. Of these there are two classes; men who intend to devote their lives to science or learning, and men who though they may not intend to devote their lives to science or learning are capable of making good use of the fruits of high intellectual training in other walks of life. Both of these classes are limited and the second perhaps is fully as limited as the first. To send an ordinary boy to college is not only to incur great expense on his account but to expose his character and especially his habits of industry to no small peril. It must rest with himself whether he will work or not, and if he has no special taste or aptitude for the work he is pretty sure to be idle. Put him into an office or a store and he must work, while he will probably pick up from his newspaper, from such books as he may be disposed to read, and from general conversation, as much knowledge as he would get by cramming at the last moment for a college examination. The scanty and undigested modicum of classics, mathematics or science, which is forgotten as soon as the examination is over, leaves scarcely any beneficial trace. Business is in itself a mental training in its way. We need not disparage the value of college friendships or college games; but friendship is not confined to college, nor are college friendships always the best; while games may be played anywhere and ought not to be what the athletic mania tends to make them, the first object of a young man's life. For a boy of ordinary capacities and tastes the best thing is regular work in an office or some steady business, with board under the roof of his parents or in some regular and moral home.

Danger looms in this quarter. The number of youths who are tempted by the easy matriculation and graduation which a number of second-rate and third-rate universities hold out is too large and is increasing daily. There is everywhere a rush into the intellectual callings. At the same time education, which once was rare and bore a high price has become so com-

mon as to lose a great part of its commercial value. The wages of educated labour are falling and those of manual labour are rising in proportion. In Germany they are crying out that all the liberal professions are overstocked and that the professional man is fain to look for a wife with a little money to enable him to eke out a livelihood. The cry is echoed in England. It will soon be echoed here. If we do not take care we shall have a number of men unfitted by university education for common work and for whom there will be no work of the higher kind, while their ambition will have been awakened and their sensibilities will have been made keen by culture. Such a class may become not only unhappy but dangerous. It is from such a class that Nihilism in Russia draws a large portion of its recruits. The idea that after a university education youths will go back to the store or to the plough and dignify lowly callings with high culture may embellish the address of University Chancellors, but has no warrant in reality. Even those who have been at Agricultural Colleges are apt not to return to the farm. In New England farm-life is at a discount. Farms are being deserted by scores. The old Puritan community seems to be in danger of going out of existence, and this is ascribed largely to the restlessness and discontent with manual labour engendered by education. Listen not to these Siren Voices. Unless you feel sure that your boy is really able and really willing to make good use of a University, keep him at home and set him at once to the regular work which is the only security for his industry and therefore for his character.

A MONTHLY
REVIEW

THE BYSTANDER

OF
CURRENT EVENTS,
CANADIAN AND GENERAL.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.		PAGE.
The Tariff in the United States ..	209	English Affairs. The St. Pancras	
Manitoba and Our Tariff	211	Election	229
A New Native Industry ..	212	Labouchere and Salisbury	230
Sir Charles Dilke on Canada	213	The End of Lord Randolph Churchill	231
The Flag on the Public Schools ..	217	The Fall of Bismarck	232
General Wilson on Commercial Union	219	German Socialism and the Claims of	
Possible and Impossible Federations	220	Labour	233
Rideau Hall	221	Russian Cruelties	235
The Rykert Case	223	The Crisis in France	236
Settling the North-West	224	The Land Question	236
North-West Representation	225	Millionaires	237
The Manitoba School Bill	226	Cremation	238
The Benwell Murder	227	Jesuit Morality	239
The Detective Service	228	Municipal Taxation in Ontario ..	239
Gentlemen Emigrants	228	Toronto University	240

Terms:

HUNTER, ROSE & COMPANY, 25 WELLINGTON ST.,
PUBLISHERS.

WHOLESALE AGENTS:

TORONTO NEWS CO., TORONTO.

Digitized by Google
MONTREAL NEWS CO., MONTREAL.

JOS. M. SORLEY, ●

TELEPHONE 1398.

Real Estate Broker,

39 ADELAIDE ST. EAST.

INVITES the attention of the public to call and examine his List of Properties, of which the following are specially recommended as being extra good investments :

Mimico, 600 feet on the Janes Survey, \$8.00 per foot,

North Toronto, 1,126 feet on Glenwood Ave., \$7.50 per foot.

" " 96 feet on Yonga Street, \$22.00 per foot.

Brockton Addition, 240 feet Mackenzie Ave., \$25.00 per foot.

" " 232 feet on Cooper Ave., \$24.00 per foot.

" " block of 1,034 feet on Royce, Albert, Longfellow and Lappin Ave's., \$20.00 per foot.

Rosedale. 150 feet on Gordon Ave., \$45.00 per foot.

Toronto Annex, lots on all streets from \$37.50 to \$100 per foot.

Loans Negotiated.

Investments Made.

Rents Collected.

JOS. M. SORLEY,

TELEPHONE 1398.

39 ADELAIDE ST. EAST.

Come and See + +

+ + the Latest Novelty

ONLY TO BE SEEN AT

Bruce's Photo. Art Studio,

132 King Street West

(OPP. ROSSIN HOUSE.)

Beautiful Permanent Pictures.

Portraits or Views on Silk or Linen.

NOW ALL THE FASHION.

GET YOUR HANDKERCHIEFS DECORATED.

GUARANTEED TO STAND WASHING.

THE BYSTANDER.

AUGUST, 1890.

MR. BLAKE'S deliverance about the Liberal Leadership, as critics have not failed to notice, is ambiguous. If it means refusal, it is the voice of nature. Nothing ever was more certainly proved by experience than that Mr. Blake's gifts are those of a forensic advocate, not those of a political leader. Even when he is speaking in the House of Commons he is always at the Bar, and his speeches, very able in their way, but prolix and over-loaded with details, fail to make a broad impression on the minds of his audience or of the people. His breakdown was decisive, nor is there the slightest reason for believing that it would not recur. What has he done since to retrieve his position? He has compromised himself in the eyes of the people by appearing as the advocate of the C. P. R. against the nation, a step which professional etiquette might technically justify but could not make either seemly or wise. He gratuitously estranged by a repellent scornfulness, which is a different thing from coldness of manner or reserve, the Equal Rights section of the Liberal party when sound policy, to say nothing of principle, bade him treat their scruples, which he could not possibly regard as otherwise than natural, with respectful sympathy and try, while he differed from them on a particular point, to keep them still his friends. He even crossed the floor of the House to throw himself ostentatiously into the arms of the enemy. These are the things which make it difficult for Mr. Blake to win the hearts of his followers, not the lack of magnetism about which so much

nonsense is talked. His political purity is unquestioned ; so are his private virtues ; but it is idle to deny the forfeiture of respect entailed by his conduct in the Riel affair and by the transparently fictitious pleas which he stooped to put forward on that occasion. It is not unlikely that in this case also he was led astray partly by his habit of speaking from a brief, the responsibility for the statements in which rests not on the advocate but on the client. What is his policy ? Nobody knows, though from time to time he appears to cast back a wistful yet irresolute glance upon the programme of the Aurora Speech. The great issue at the next election will be financial and commercial. But financial and commercial questions are precisely those to which least attention has been paid by Mr. Blake. About the National Policy he wavered long, seemed at last to have embraced Revenue Tariff, and then in his Malvern Speech on the very eve of battle, half-hauled down his colours, with the inevitable result of disheartening his own ranks, while he drew not a single deserter from those of the enemy. His personal leaning, so far as can be discerned, is to a junction with Sir John Thompson, while the action of his chief confidant indicates a continued craving for the fatal alliance with the Nationalists and Ultramontanes of Quebec. When a man of great promise has failed there is a natural desire to give him a second trial ; but the sympathy which is bestowed on the unfortunate general must be extended to the unfortunate army. It is difficult to believe that under such a leader the Liberals can hope to turn total defeat into victory.

The ambiguity of that part of Mr. Blake's letter which relates to himself necessarily extends to the part which relates to Mr. Laurier. Mr. Blake may mean that he wishes Mr. Laurier to be definitively accepted and heartily supported as the leader, or he may mean only that the time for taking out the warming-pan has not yet come. If he means the first he has great difficulties to surmount. He can hardly disguise from himself the fact that though, owing mainly to the advantages attending a long possession of power combined with the personal weak-

ness of the Opposition, Mr. Mowat has won the Ontario elections, there is a strong ground-swell of repugnance to Ultramontanism and priestly domination. To reconcile British and Protestant Liberals to French and Catholic leadership, the leader must at least bring a substantial accession of force. But Mr. Laurier brings with him no such accession. If he leads French Liberalism, it is as a man leads a wild horse by clinging desperately to its tail. At the Mercier Banquet he faintly breathed Moderation, while Nationalism thundered applause at the salutation of the Tricolor. Sir Richard Cartwright, who is now practically the head of Ontario Liberalism, may not be an ideal leader, but at all events he is a strong and resolute man, he thoroughly knows his own mind, he is a political not a forensic speaker, and he is perfectly master of the question upon which battle at the coming election will be joined. Mr. Laurier's character is such as to make it comparatively easy for Sir Richard to maintain with him a relation which might be awkward if he were not so unselfish or his temper were not so good. Unless a heaven-born leader should appear, the Liberals had better remain as they are. If, however, they have made up their minds, as at present appears, to an alliance with Rielism and a flirtation with Socialism, their choice of a leader is not of so much importance.

—At the triumphal banquet given by the Club National, Mr. Mercier pointed to the Tricolor and said, "This flag, gentlemen, you know. It is the National flag. The Government which you have you know. It is the National Government. The party which I have before me I know. This flag, this government, and this party are to-night honoured by the National Club. It is a national triumph which we celebrate to-night, and not national merely in name but national in tendencies, aspirations and sentiments." After this who can question the aims of the party which the late election has shown to be dominant in Quebec? Who can doubt that be-

tween the British and Protestant sections of the Dominion there is being formed a French nationality, under the moral sovereignty not of the Queen but of the Pope? Who can fail to see that a New France stands in the way of our efforts to bring about the national unity of the Dominion? Nor is New France the creation of Mr. Mercier or dependent for its existence on his continuance in power. It is the natural outcome of influences which have been allowed and even encouraged by our party leaders to operate till they have got beyond control. When there is a solid mass of people of one race inhabiting a compact territory with a language, religion, character, laws, tendencies, aspirations and sentiments of its own, there is *de facto* a nation. That Canada has power to absorb or assimilate this nation is what nobody can imagine. The time was when the growth of French nationality and of the Ultramontane theocracy connected with it might have been prevented, but that time has long since passed away.

The Liberal Premiers of the other Provinces, excepting the Province of Manitoba, were invited to the banquet, but with one accord they made excuse. Mr. Mowat sent a letter which was intended we presume to be taken as an expression of sympathy, but in fact was a long-drawn sigh. Could there be a stronger proof of the severance of Quebec parties and politics from those of the rest of the Dominion? There still remains in Quebec a British and Protestant outpost which as its numbers dwindle will find itself more and more compelled to look to its main body for protection: apart from this, and from such adhesion to the Ottawa Government as the sheer payment of subsidies can command, how much of political connection is left? There is not, it seems, to be a single representative of the British element in the Cabinet. So much for the British conquest of Quebec! All the more ought we to guard against French and Ultramontane encroachment the integrity of the British Province.

Mr. Mercier with his Nationalists has wrung from the fears and rivalries of the two British parties the renunciation of the

political veto, that is of all national control over Provincial legislation. But he does not mean to stop there; he calls for further concessions to French nationality which he will probably be able to extort, as he has the renunciation of the political veto. Not that that he means to leave us alone. He means to direct his serried phalanx of votes upon Ottawa and compel us to shoulder the Quebec debt. In this also he may reasonably hope for success so far as the politicians are concerned: in fact the Dutch auction has already opened; but he will have to reckon with the Equal Right movement and will find that though it may not be able to carry elections against the Machines it will make the Machines feel its power.

—At the Cameron Banquet Mr. Mowat referred to Sir John Macdonald's Kingston Speech and made a strenuous effort to repel the calamitous embrace of the Tory chief. He tried to represent Sir John's words as a mere personal amenity which he returned in kind. It will not do. Sir John not only said that Mr. Mowat was a very nice person, but congratulated him on the renewal of public confidence in him, in other words, on his victory in the elections. It is understood that Sir John has expressed himself plainly elsewhere, and his deeds have corresponded with his words, for, passively at all events, he "knifed" Mr. Meredith. Sir Hector Langevin's organ claimed Mr. Mowat's victory as a triumph for the Macdonald Government, and a triumph for the Macdonald Government it unquestionably was. We hold then to our diagnosis. Mr. Mowat is the Sir John Macdonald of Ontario. The two Premiers receive in turn the well-earned support of the Roman Catholic vote. Mr. Mowat, like Sir John Macdonald, regards the Americans as "a hostile nation," and is no great friend to Reciprocity. Questions of jurisdiction on boundaries, such as there have been between the two men, are not questions of policy. On questions of policy the two are radically at one, while the

same pillar upholds the power of both. We take some credit to ourselves for having seen this fact before it was proclaimed by authority at Kingston.

—Mr. Meredith has a perfectly good part to play if he has the force and spirit to play it. He may very soon redeem the defeat which he owed to his lack of presentable men and to his fatal connection with Ottawa. He has only to make up his mind to be the head of a Provincial party, British in opposition to French encroachment, Protestant in opposition to hierarchical domination, and rationally Conservative in opposition to the Socialism which the other party appears to be adopting as a plank in its platform. He will then be in the true position of a Conservative leader in Ontario, and will soon find that he has a strong body of opinion on his side. With the tariff question he need not directly concern himself. It belongs to the Dominion, not to the Province. The last election, in which Ottawa deserted him and openly rejoiced over his defeat, relieves him from all inconvenient obligations in that quarter. It has rid him also of Sir John Macdonald's chief agent. Unless the public should suddenly develop a taste for literary bilge-water, he is likely soon to be rid of Sir John Macdonald's organ. His great want still is men and this want is not likely to be supplied while the party remains a broken-down donkey engine of Dominion Toryism, without object or principle of its own, and used only to keep Ontario in financial thralldom to Quebec. But when once there is life and hope in a cause or a party men appear. The only question is whether Mr. Meredith has the force and spirit. But if he has not, why does he remain where he is? A man could not have a more unsatisfactory part to play than he has had for the last eight years. To go on playing it would be not only unsatisfactory but ignominious.

—It is to be hoped that the Ontario Opposition will move, were it only by way of protest, for the restoration of the electoral rights of Toronto. A more shameless gerrymander never was perpetrated than that by which the Party in power appropriated one of the seats for this city. The city is practically reduced to a single elective member, the vote of one of the two elective members being killed by that of the Act of Parliament nominee. Toronto is well entitled to more than three members, and there is no reason why she should not have her full number, especially as her wealth and intelligence are more than proportionate to her population. It is said that some of the members for other ridings are residents of Toronto; suppose they are, what political advantage does that give her? The entire House of Commons is resident in the British metropolis for more than half the year; yet this is not urged as a reason against giving London her fair share of representation. At all events let Toronto's three members be hers. The three-cornered system has been tried and condemned in England. It lingers now, we believe, nowhere except at Capetown, and there in a decrepit and discredited state. Its consequence, besides the falsification of the popular verdict, is that the minority member is nailed to his seat, unable either to resign or take office, lest the seat should be lost to his party. Thus a man distinguished enough to be eligible to office can never take a minority seat. But the object was not to improve the representation by giving the minority a voice: it was only to give a dominant party by Act of Parliament a seat which was not theirs by election.

—The transit of Mr. Edward Farrer from one journal to another has made a sensation which is the highest and most sincere of all compliments to the power of his pen. If we refer to it, however, it is for the purpose of pointing a moral. The awkward part of the business, as hostile critics do not fail to point out, is that not long ago Mr. Farrer as a writer in the

journal which he is now leaving was being personally attacked by the journal to which his pen is transferred. Let journalists, if they have the slightest regard for the interests or character of the Press, learn to respect the privilege of impersonality, and while they combat the articles to let the writers alone. The responsibility for the line taken by a journal rests not on the writer but on the editor; if it did not, anonymous journalism would be at an end. A writer when attacked by name cannot defend himself, or even deny the authorship of an article if it is not his, without breach of duty to his management: nothing therefore can be more unfair or cowardly than the practice of personal attack. Its obvious tendency is to degrade the Press by driving from its service every man who has a character to be assailed and who shrinks from smirching it in blackguard brawls. It was indeed for this very purpose that recourse was had to the practice by the Press tyrant to whom its extension in Canadian journalism is largely due. It may be, as some contend, that anonymous journalism is a bad system and that signed articles would be better. That is a tenable view. But if anonymous journalism is to continue, the law of impersonality must be upheld.

Why cannot journalism like other intellectual callings be a regular profession and have its code of honour, with the means of enforcing the law against delinquents? Why is it that one journal should so often be seen dealing foul blows at another, and that the people should have to look on while their reputed instructors and guides roll together in the mud and gouge each other like Texan rowdies? Why is it that the whole Press should be disgraced by infamous "enterprise" without the possibility of calling its black sheep to account and purging itself of their vileness? Partly perhaps the cause is to be found in the nomad habits of "Bohemians," which make it difficult to bring them into any association or under any controlling influence, and baffled even Mr. Ross Robertson's patriotic effort to establish a Journalists' Club in Toronto. Whatever be the cause the effect is very bad.

—The triumph of the Jesuits has brought to Quebec, whence it will operate on the Dominion, another corps of the Papal militia. The Franciscans, it is now announced, have landed and are displaying to an edified people the hard boards on which they sleep, the sackcloth which forms their bedding, and all the paraphernalia of their asceticism. After all, they have nothing to compare with the pillar of Simeon Stylites or with the hooks in the flesh of an Indian Fakir. So in the thirteenth century they landed in England, staining the ground with their bleeding feet, and living on alms from door to door. Very soon they became wealthy and corrupt. Every tendency which has largely prevailed among mankind is pretty sure at one time to have had good in it. Asceticism is no exception to the rule. It was a sort of convulsive effort of man to set himself free from the tyranny of his sensual appetites, which, in an uncivilized age and in the absence of any support from medical science, he could hardly have done by cool unassisted reason. The asceticism of the missionary was also, no doubt, very useful in impressing the imaginations of barbarians who were themselves the slaves of fleshly lusts. These good effects were never unalloyed, since the idea that self-torture or self-maceration was holiness must always have given a false and degrading idea of God. Moreover extremes produce reaction and the riot of the carnival was the natural concomitant of the Lenten fast. Medical science, which like all truth is the voice of God, is now our guide in the performance of our physical duty, which is to keep our bodies in the best possible order for all the purposes of life. To this end abstinence may often be useful; asceticism never can be. The day of asceticism, as well as that of thaumaturgy, is past. The net result of this new irruption of friars probably will be a further draining by ecclesiastical suction of the wealth of Quebec ending in increased need of subsidies from the Dominion. What the Jesuit palmerworm leaves the Franciscan locust will devour, and Ontario and Protestant Montreal in the end will pay for all.

—The triumph and reinforcement of the army of clerical reaction is naturally accompanied by a fresh development of thaumaturgy. Miracles are again announced at Ste. Anne de Beaupré, and we are told that twelve hundred pilgrims have resorted at once to her shrine. If Ste. Anne de Beaupré wishes really to demonstrate her miraculous power and convince the unbelieving, why does she not replace a lost limb, cure somebody of cancer, or restore sight to the blind? Why does she confine herself to cases of nervous ailment or hysteria in the magical treatment of which she has successful rivals in the most notorious charlatans? Why, we may also ask, does she perform her miracles in a corner, and in the corner of all the world where they are least needed, among the devout peasantry of Quebec? Why does she not perform them in some centre of sceptical intelligence, such as Toronto, Chicago, or New York? Of course all of the poor peasants who are drawn to her shrine leave some of their scant earnings behind them. Is it possible to believe that the hierophants of Ste. Anne de Beaupré, any more than those of St. Januarius, of the House of Loretto, or of the Holy Coat of Treves, are themselves the perfectly honest victims of the gainful delusion which they maintain?

—We did not say “the name of priest is perfidy.” What we said was “*in politics* the name of priest is perfidy.” Nor did we speak of Roman Catholic priests only, but of all priests, Roman, Greek, Anglican or Coptic, and of all clergymen of whatever denomination who leave the field of religious duty to engage in that of political intrigue. If anyone doubts the justice of the remark so far as the Roman Catholic Church is concerned let him review the history of the dealings of Popes and their satellites in former days with the monarchies of the time, those of the Catholic clergy with the political parties of modern Europe, and those of the hierarchical wielders of the Catholic vote with the political parties of the United States,

this country and Australia. Is not the Catholic vote in this Province given for the Liberals in Provincial elections and then immediately transferred to the Conservatives in elections for the Dominion? When priests are trying, for an end of their own, which has no relation to the interests of the commonwealth, to play off one party against another and reign by the division, how can they be otherwise than perfidious? Is not perfidy, in that case, the very basis of their strategy? Some ecclesiastical organ it seems has been calling for the infliction of civil penalties on those who like us dare to criticize the action of a political priesthood. To the restoration of the Inquisition we have no doubt we should come in due time if the propagandists of the Encyclical could have their way, but at present we have got no further than the restoration of the Jesuit Estates.

—The Prime Minister of Manitoba alone of all the Liberal Prime Ministers was honoured with an exclusion from the list of invitations to the Mercier banquet. Let him take this not only as an acknowledgment that he is loyal to British civilization and to the organic principles of society in the New World, but as a warning that he and his Province have little to do with the imbroglios of old Canadian parties, or with the struggles of their leaders for power. His principal task is to promote the development of his Province and to relieve her of those remaining shackles which prevent her from moving forwards on her destined course of prosperity. From railway monopoly she has been set free, after a struggle which revealed at once the temper of her railway despot and the indifference of Ottawa to anything concerning her except her votes. But railways are of comparatively little use unless goods can be freely carried over them. So long as the tariff continues in existence, the monopoly of the C. P. R. will practically be to a great extent maintained. Commercial liberty is the object to which the efforts of Manitoban and North-Western statesmen

ought henceforth to be steadily directed. Without access to the Continental market Manitoba may subsist but cannot flourish or hope to compete with her rivals Minnesota and Dakota, which are within the commercial pale. It is impossible not to regard with suspicion the subsidy now held out by the Ottawa Government to the Hudson's Bay Railroad. There are two sinister objects which such a subsidy may be intended to serve. It may be intended, like so many similar grants, to purchase votes and it may be intended to turn the eyes of the people away from the south, where their natural market both for buying and selling lies, to the north and the distant market of England. The English market this year is likely to be exceptionally good, if it is true that the English crops have failed, and that those of Russia are below the average. But taking a series of years it is a declining as well as a distant market and will decline the faster as Indian wheat land is brought under the plough. The Continental market, on the other hand, will be always improving as the population grows and as the wheat land is taken up and exhausted. Nothing could blind any one to this fact but political fancies which are not bread. Manitoba seems now to be awakened to the necessities of the situation and bent on discarding the representatives who have betrayed her, and sending to Ottawa a trustworthy delegation. When the time comes she will have to brace her sinews for the struggle, for every engine will be plied both by the Government and by the C. P. R. But without brave and strenuous effort nothing worth having is to be won.

— It seems that through some "traitorous" channel a doubt has found its way to the Australians whether the success of Canadian Confederation is so assured that they have only to tread in our footsteps. The Nationalist victory in Quebec and the Mercier Banquet, with the Tricolor unfurled, if any report of them reaches the Antipodes, are not likely to remove the hesitation. Let the Australians come here and judge for

themselves. Let them form their own opinion as to the completeness of the unity which has been established between Ontario and Quebec, between the Provinces on the Atlantic and those on the Pacific. Let them inspect the Dominion Statute Book and see what the Federal Parliament does for its money. Let them examine not only the paper Constitution but the actual polity, and study the working as well as the structure of the Machine. The real government in their hemisphere as in ours is Party. Let them, with the example of Canada before their eyes to aid their forecast, try to figure to themselves what their Federal Parties will be, and what will be the relations between the Federal Parties and those of the several colonies. Let them consider how the influence of the Federal Parties over the several colonies will be kept up. Let them measure, still with our example in view, the amount not only of expenditure but of corruption, demagogism and faction which the creation of a Federal Government as a prize of perpetual contention between Federal Parties, will entail. Already, as we have more than once pointed out, they are practically federated for all the ordinary purposes of such unions, as a group of colonies under the same Crown. If Independence was the aim of the Australians, federation would be necessary for the purposes of external security and extension as well as for that of internal peace. But otherwise they had better count the full cost before they take the leap. Once more, we say, let them come here and judge for themselves. Let them judge for themselves, after inquiring not only among the officials at Ottawa, or among enthusiasts of Imperialism into whose hands visitors are apt to fall, but among people of different shades of opinion and in different parts of the country. To be the guiding light of Australia would be a great honour to us, but to be her will-o'-the-wisp would not.

—To make a whole population supremely happy for three days is an arduous undertaking. The Toronto Carnival was

almost doomed to failure by its length apart from the slips into which inexperience was sure to fall, such as Chinese lamps multitudinous but unlighted, bands without stands to perform on, and fireworks too distant for effect. Nobody but the hotel-keepers, the street railway, the vendors of ice cream and the hackmen cries encore. We doubt whether even the hotel-keepers of the higher class received any equivalent for their Carnival assessment. It is impossible to think that our people got an amount of pleasure at all commensurate with the expense, the trouble and a disturbance of industry which extends beyond the days of the Festival. Nor has our city risen at all in the eyes of strangers who were tempted to visit it by the grandiloquence of the programme. The notion that dissipation is "good for trade," is like the delusion of the king of France, who fancied that kings gave alms by spending money on their pleasures. What the people have spent in pleasure they cannot have to spend in dry-goods, and probably little money is laid out by carnival visitors at the stores. Let us have popular recreation by all means; there is no apparent reason against making it a regular department of municipal government. But let us go rationally to work. Some active or scheming spirit starts a fancy, and whips up for it a little factitious popularity. Then no one dares to say a word against it and we all roll headlong into a fiasco. Heaven forbid that this new gate should be opened for municipal ambition!

—A little excitement, with Chinese lamps and fireworks, is good sometimes to break the monotony of labour. But the best of all recreation is that which is taken quietly and in a regular way. Parks are the safety-valves of city life. Yet we allow the Parks of Toronto piece by piece to be destroyed. Walpole uttered almost a literal truth when he said that the cost of closing Hyde Park would be three crowns. In this country we have politics in plenty, but not so much of

public spirit, otherwise a stand would have been made against putting the Parliament Buildings where they are. And now another large slice, which is at present the play-ground of our boys, is going, and if you say a word for its preservation an organ which professes to speak for the working classes meets you with taunts and sneers. Nobody proposed that the University should give the land to the city, but Mr. Dwight and others thought that there might be a chance of obtaining such terms as would enable the city, possibly with some help from voluntary effort, to secure the lease. That the Trustees of the University are legal owners of the land and have full disposing power over it is indisputable. But property in a Park which was attached by a public grant to a public institution and has long been enjoyed by the people, can hardly be said to be exactly on the same footing as ordinary property. The Colleges of Oxford and Cambridge have a legal power of selling or closing Parks and walks attached to them which they could not exercise without incurring public odium. The question is, at all events, one seriously affecting the welfare of the people of Toronto, and it is strange that a popular organ should meet an effort to solve it in this interest with taunts and sneers.

—Whether in excluding the Executive from the Legislature the framers of the American Constitution were actuated by purism, by deference to the theory of Montesquieu, or by deliberate statesmanship, is doubtful. The result, however, has been to leave the House of Representatives without leadership and to expose it to the danger of anarchy. The only available leader is the Speaker who, as the Chairman, ought properly to be judicial and impartial. Speaker Carlisle acted on the theory of judicial impartiality, and the result was that the House became a struggling mob, each member of which striving for his own measure thwarted all the rest, and no business could be done. Speaker Reed, a strong Partisan, a violent Pro-

tectionist, and a man of masterful and unscrupulous temper, has acted on the opposite theory, and has restored the legislative efficiency of the House with a vengeance. The work of seven months includes the passage of the bill for a new Tariff, the Customs Administration Bill, Bills for an extension of the use of Silver in the standard currency and for the Federal control of National Elections, a new general Pension Bill, a Bill for the admission of two new States to the Union, and the adoption of new and revolutionary Rules of Procedure. These were all contested measures, and the same may be said of the numerous resolutions passed for the unseating of Democratic members in favour of Republican contestants, the Chicago World's Fair Bill, and of many items in the General Appropriation Bills, as those pertaining to the increase of the Navy and the improvement of the great waterways. An important Bill has also passed to give effect to the recommendations of the International Maritime Conference which sat at Washington last winter. Among other Bills of the first-class sure to pass are those for the restraint of mercantile combines and monopolies and for permitting the State to regulate or forbid the sale of intoxicants brought from one State into another. It is true, the principal measures are as bad as possible, but they have passed, and Speaker Reed may flatter himself that he has renovated the power of legislation. He has renovated in equal measure the power of appropriation. To lavish five hundred millions of dollars in a single session is a proof of vigour and one which, unless the American people are out of their senses, will tell on the chances of the party in power at the approaching Congressional elections.

—The Bill for the exercise of Federal control over National elections, which forms one of the list, is intended to force political power into the hands of the negroes at the South for the benefit of the Republican party. Hitherto the negro, though legally invested with the suffrage, has not been

allowed by the whites to vote. He has been practically in a state of political suppression, while the South has been kept solid for the Democratic party. The expectation that there would be a division of parties among the whites, and that in time the negro would be called in to the aid of one of the parties, and would thus acquire liberty of voting, has so far been belied. The whites have remained a unit for the ascendancy of their race. If Federal force is now to be used to give the negro the free exercise of the ballot, and enable him to overturn white ascendancy in the interest of a party in the North, a very serious crisis may ensue. The problem of the races is at best one of desperate difficulty, since political equality without social equality is hardly possible, while social equality is impossible without intermarriage. Probably wisdom would acquiesce in the provisional exclusion of the negro from political power which he neither greatly values nor knows how to exercise, and would rest content with securing to him his industrial freedom and his personal rights. But faction in its frenzy looks at nothing except the means of passing its rival in the neck-and-neck race for power. When the National Election Bill is carried into execution, a storm can hardly fail to arise.

—The new Silver Coinage Act passed by the United States Congress is beneath contempt as a measure of finance. As a concession to the greed of the owners of silver mines and the ignorance, prevalent in the Western and Southern States, that takes a deluge of bad money for a flood of new wealth and clamours for a debased currency as a means of prosperity, the Act possesses the merit of putting off the evil day of a change from the gold to the silver standard of values, and thus affords opportunity for the intelligence of the country to rescue the Union from financial disaster, the shadow of which has been over it ever since the original Silver Coinage Act of 1878. On the other hand, the silver interest has gained by

the Act an advanced position from which to continue its attacks upon the financial system. It is impossible to forecast how long that system can maintain itself under the steady flow of so fluctuating a medium as silver into the national currency. A crash brought on by this juggling with the currency would bring people to their senses and firmly re-establish the gold standard, but the price paid for experience would be high. If the drain upon the Federal revenues continues at its present rate, the Treasury will be forced to resort to its accumulation of depreciated silver dollars, in which case the illusory character of the promises of the Act for maintaining the parity of the two metals will appear. The working of the party system was signally illustrated in connection with this Bill. The Senate, dividing upon sectional and not upon party lines, passed a radical measure that would have made the maintenance of the gold standard impossible. The House of Representatives, also without a party division, passed a conservative measure under which the maintenance of the gold standard would have been certain and comparatively easy. The differences between the two measures were reconciled by a conference committee, upon which both parties were properly represented. This committee brought in a unanimous report in favour of a compromise measure. Against this report Democratic members in both Houses voted almost solidly. Their obvious object in so doing was that in the coming general election they might tell the electorate in the Eastern States that the Republicans have betrayed the gold standard, and in the West and South that the Republicans have been disloyal to silver, and have sold out to Wall Street. Such is the relation of party motives to the public good.

The Behring Sea controversy has moved in a circle and come back to the point from which it started nearly four years ago. By discovery, exploration, settlement, occupation and general consent, extending over more than a century and a half of time,

the right of Russia and of her grantee, the United States, to monopolize the fur seal fishery is asserted to be absolute. There is just enough of colour in such a claim to persuade the Americans to cling to it, and more than enough of doubt as to its soundness to justify England and Canada in insisting that it shall be at least submitted to some impartial tribunal. Whatever negotiations are now to go forward between the two governments, will in all probability point to arbitration. Even in this restricted field there is room for misunderstanding. The British Government requires an arbitration embracing the entire question, while the government of the United States wishes to start with the assumption that down to the time of its purchase of Russia's rights in North America, the government of the Czar did in fact exercise effectively and without question, the precise jurisdiction over the Behring Sea fisheries now claimed for the United States. Neither the Behring Sea question nor the Fisheries question with the United States however is so dangerous as the fishery question with France, because what France hugs is not the claim by the quarrel.

Much that had been incomprehensible in the conduct of the Washington authorities, since negotiations were resumed between Mr. Blaine and Sir Julian Pauncefote, has been cleared up. We now know that the long negotiation for a close season in the seal fishery, which was the occasion for the appearance of representatives of Russia and Canada in the conferences held at Mr. Blaine's house, was entered upon at the direct suggestion of the American negotiator and was broken off by Mr. Blaine because he could not carry his advance point of a continuous close season from the middle of April to the middle of October in each year. As an alternative, Sir Julian Pauncefote offered two close seasons, one while the female seals were moving in and another while they were moving out of Behring Sea, subject to such modifications as a mixed commission of experts should determine. This offer seems an entirely reasonable one, and the refusal to accept it throws doubt on Mr. Blaine's sincerity in inviting discussion of

a close season, based upon common interests and without reference to the particular claims advanced by the United States. It is not yet clear why the American government in addition to its needless withdrawal from a line of negotiation proposed by itself, should have come to the utterly indefensible resolution to resume its assertion of a claim to the exclusive right of fishery in Behring Sea. The solution is probably to be found not in a new view of the question of international law, but in the weakness of Canada's position on this continent as an outlying dependency of a country which has but a faint interest in her quarrels, and, being itself pressed by dangers of all kinds in its own hemisphere, is unable to act with vigour and effect in her behalf.

—We almost lose patience in reading the nonsense that is sent over here for the delectation of Fenian or socialistic palates about convulsions in the British Ministry and the approach of a Dissolution. Everybody who has private correspondents in England must know that all this is trash. There may be differences of opinion in the Cabinet about particular measures or points of strategy, but English statesmen know how to be true to each other, to the common cause, and to the country, of whose perilous situation the ministers must of all men be the most sensible. There is, no doubt, among the regular Tories of the Lowther type a jealousy of Mr. Goschen ; but Mr. Goschen has the steady support of the Liberal Unionists whom he represents in the Cabinet and on whose votes the existence of the Government depends. To suppose that with a majority of more than seventy the ministers will in deference to the clamour of their opponents dissolve Parliament and run the risk of a general election is to suppose they are in their dotage. The snap division taken the other evening when the supporters of the Government were absent at Ascot, though hailed with a yell of triumph, could have no significance whatever; at least it could be significant only as a revelation of the un-

happy truth that the man who has none but public interest in politics grows weary of the work, while the professional demagogue is never tired. The minority too, it must be remembered, on this and on all occasions, is made up of the most heterogeneous elements: Mr. Gladstone, Sir Wm. Harcourt, Mr. Labouchere, Mr. Bradlaugh, Dr. Tanner, Mr. William Healy, and Mr. Cunningham Graham, can have no object in common except the overthrow of the Government, and were they victorious to-morrow, the veriest cat's chorus would ensue. It seems clear that the introduction of the Licenses Bill was a mistake. It was a mistake, in our humble judgment, to bring on controverted legislation which could possibly be put off while the House of Commons is in such a condition that legislation of any kind is hardly possible. The first object should be by measures as strong and broad as the necessity of the case may require to drag all legislation out of the quagmire of Obstruction and restore the efficiency, independence and dignity of the House of Commons.

The state of things in England, however, whether in Parliament or out of it, is ominous in the highest degree. In Parliament, Constitutional government, seems to have come to an end. It is possible, as we have said before, only if the minority will allow the majority to govern. But the present minority, rather than let the majority govern, is prepared to bring on Parliamentary anarchy and to wreck the Constitution. As an English writer says, the Session of 1890 is without a parallel for wanton waste of Parliamentary energy and for the successful application of the novel arts of unscrupulous Opposition. "How to prevent the Government from governing; how to hinder the Legislature from legislating; how to sap the health, exhaust the vitality and undermine the lives of individual Ministers; how to damage Parliamentary institutions by constantly recurring scenes, insults and outrages;—these have now become the main features in the strategy of Her Majesty's Opposition for carrying on what used to be manly, honourable and patriotic Party warfare." The writer is also fully justi-

fied in saying that there is no difference between the conduct of Mr. Gladstone or Sir William Harcourt and that of the Irish members. There is none, at least except in regard to brutality of manner, which the Irish members, taken some of them from the same social stratum as Tammany, exhibit to an extent very faintly represented by the reports, and at once astounding and revolting to an eye-witness of the scenes. Not the least deadly of the effects of Obstruction is the "sapping of the health of individual ministers" whose lives are thus worn out in struggling against the ruffianism, inarticulate as well as articulate, of members imposed on Irish electors by the fiat of Mr. Parnell. Meantime, Mr. Gladstone has been acting, to borrow Tyndall's phrase, as 'a universal blast-furnace of sedition.' Not only has he succeeded in rekindling in Scotland and Wales, as well as in Ireland, old Provincial jealousies which threaten the integrity of the nation, but by his incitements to popular defiance of law and order in Ireland, and by appeals to the masses against the classes, he has evoked a spirit of resistance to authority, and is scattering the seeds of revolution. Animated and morally countenanced by him, agitators, political, social and industrial, are at work in all directions. These incendiaries have already filled the industrial world with disturbance; they are now apparently proceeding to undermine the fidelity of the police and of the army. The mutinous movement in the Guards is regarded as their work. When it comes to this, Faction is not far from over-stepping the line which separates political conflict from civil war.

—In the meantime, a gleam of light, though probably a fugitive and deceptive gleam, appears in an unexpected quarter of the sky. Mr. Parnell has been seized with an apparent fit of moderation, has spoken courteously to Mr. Balfour, and signified his disposition to compromise on the question of the Irish Land Bill. This man has always been an enigma, impenetrable even to his followers, whom he treats as his social

inferiors and excludes from his inmost councils. In estimating his professions we must not lose sight of his avowal before the Commission of Inquiry, that he had told the House of Commons a deliberate falsehood for a strategical purpose. His present moderation, however, is regarded as sincere by his Irish brigade as well as by their allies the Radicals, and it has produced a wild outburst of wrath, with cries for the deposition of the recreant chief. By Mr. Morley and other philosophers of the Home Rule school it was always contended that, Parnell possessing the confidence of his countrymen, it was folly not to negotiate with the man who had power to agree to a settlement. The answer was that what Irish agitators wanted was not a settlement but agitation, and that as soon as a leader showed himself disposed to agree to a settlement he would fall. The childishness of fancying that terms can be made with a set of men who subsist by disaffection is manifest to all but the most philosophic eyes. Of Mr. Parnell's moderation the probable cause is the failure of funds which are running low because the American Fenians care little for amendments of land tenure, much less for constitutional improvements, and are disposed to subscribe only to rebellion. Another theory is that Mr. Parnell's nerve is shaken by the O'Shea case. Mr. Parnell, it will be remembered, by his fiat forced the complainant in the O'Shea case as a representative on the electors of Galway. A pleasant foretaste this of the vast increase of liberty and dignity which would accrue to Irish constituencies from Home Rule!

—Mr. Caine has signally displayed the moral weakness and the lurking vanity of the fanatic. He was a strong Unionist, so strong as to give rather special umbrage to the Home Rulers. But he quarrels with the Government because it will not consent, at his tyrannical dictation, to rob people who with the direct sanction of the State have invested their money in public houses. Not content with speaking and voting against

the Licéñse Bill, he resigns his seat and appeals to the moral universe. The moral universe, by way of response to his appeal, refuses him re-election by a very large majority. Hereupon his pique transports him beyond all bounds, and reckless of what he has himself proclaimed to be the vital interests of the country, he flings down his Unionism at the feet of Mr. Gladstone, who treats him with deserved contempt. Lord Salisbury and his colleagues are men of unblemished character, and no man in his senses can imagine that they are less desirous of promoting temperance than Mr. Caine. But they know that it is the highest duty of a Government to uphold justice and that the first victims of injustice are sure to be the discredited and the weak. The publican or the Irish landlord may be the first to be robbed, but he will not be the last. From what we learn, it would seem that we are not likely to hear much more of Prohibitionist legislation in England at present. Nobody will venture again to propose compensation, while the resistance to confiscation is still too strong to be lightly faced. As to the loss of such a man as Mr. Caine to the Unionist cause, it is the loss of dry rot to a ship.

—Lord Wolseley's words deprecating any thought of war between England and the United States might be entitled 'Hints from a soldier who has smelt powder to soldiers who have not smelt powder.' They come in season. Nobody believes in a frightful diplomatic crisis or in the imminence of a naval collision in Behring's Sea. The triangular negotiation is at present dragging its slow length through a voluminous correspondence, carried on with tedious formalities of transmission and retransmission among the three governments. But the party which is in power in the United States is in a rather dangerous mood. It suspects that unless some abnormal force, such as a violent Granger movement, should upset politics altogether, it will be beaten in the Fall Elections, and that its loss of the House of Representatives will be followed by its loss of the

Executive power in the next Presidential contest. Its McKinley tariff and its Federal Election Bill are measures of despair. It is therefore tempted to violent courses in diplomacy both for the purpose of diverting public attention from the tariff question and for that of baling out surplus revenue in war expenditure. Lord Wolseley knows Canada and knows what American invasion would be. Our Jingoes have been brandishing an opinion given by an English officer to the effect that the invader would again be repulsed as he was in 1812. There must be a gap in the officer's historic consciousness of seventy-eight years. Since 1812 all has been changed. The country has ceased to be a natural fortress of forest which the bushranger could defend against regular troops. It has been laid perfectly open for military operations. On our frontier have grown up great cities which would be at the mercy of the invader. Railways would enable the enemy to concentrate his overwhelming resources, and steam would make him master of the Lakes, every point on the northern shores of which he would threaten with superior force. We have no army, nor could we create one in anything like the time allowed by the swift march of modern war. It takes, we believe, about six months to make a good infantry soldier, a year to make a cavalry soldier, and a still longer time to make a good artilleryman. A weak point of all volunteer forces is their lack of non-commissioned officers, who are the muscle and sinews of a regiment. These the British volunteers might perhaps draw at need from the Line, but Canada will have no such source of supply. Those who brag about a levy *en masse* must be half-conscious that they are talking nonsense. When Palmerston was told that in case of invasion the people would rise as one man, he replied 'Yes, and they would be knocked down again as one man.' Does anybody seriously think that supposing enough enthusiasm to exist there would be any use in calling out an immense mob, which has never had arms in its hands, to oppose a drilled force of any kind? We have no equipments of war, no staff, no general who has ever handled a large

body of men under fire. The army of the Americans is small, it is true, and soldiers do not speak highly of their militia. But they have all the equipments of war, and their immense resources would enable them to buy men. They must have among them a number of immigrants drilled under the military systems of Europe. If England were to bombard their seaboard cities, they could retaliate on Toronto and Montreal. Another vital difference between the situation in 1812 and the present is that now we have in the midst of us a French nation, while the French are no longer kept true to us by antagonism to the Puritans of New England, but, on the contrary, are bound to New England by the presence there of three or four hundred thousand of their kinsmen. That Canadians would again do what men could in defence of their country and their rights is our proud hope and belief; but that is no reason why we should allow any Bombastes Furioso, from mere love of hectoring, to bring down an avalanche of calamity on our homes.

—All speculation about peace or war in Europe, interesting as they are to us (since if England fights Canada must bleed), will be futile so long as the issues of peace and war are locked in the breasts of autocrats and diplomatists, or dependent on accidents, such as a quarrel in Central Africa, in Bulgaria, in Afghanistan, or on the coast of Newfoundland. Bismarck has recorded the fact that at the time of the war between France and Austria, that bosom friend of England Louis Napoleon, after publicly embracing the British Queen, was trying to get up a maritime alliance with the continental powers for the purpose of crushing British power in the Mediterranean. Louis Napoleon's design of attacking Austria was masked by the most solemn disclaimers of any warlike intentions, and the French ambassador Pelissier, in an interview with the British Foreign Minister, took it on his personal honour that no military preparations were going on in France, though a few

weeks afterwards France invaded Italy with an army of a hundred and fifty thousand men. If we want to divine what is coming we must watch events. To read cabled rumours is waste of time ; so it is to read reports of interviews. Diplomats know how to be perfectly frank with an interviewer and yet tell him nothing. The inner councils of Russia, of which we see little, and the conflict of motives in the breast of the Czar, of which we see nothing, are still the main factor in the situation.

—A work just published by Dr. Child, of Oxford University, has an interest for those who are trying to get rid in this country of the last vestiges of the connection between Church and State. Plainer words, it might seem, were never spoken than "My kingdom is not of this world." But they were so interpreted through a series of ages as to mean "My kingdom is not of this world until my servants can get temporal power into their hands;" and the fruits of the interpretation have been those dark or sometimes crimsoned pages of history which record the relations between Church and State. Dr. Child has given us a careful study of those relations during the period comprised in his work. He shows plainly enough that the Church of England having been under Papal supremacy during the Middle Ages fell after the rupture between Henry VIII. and the Papacy not less completely under the supremacy of the King, and was moulded and remoulded not by Convocation or any ecclesiastical authority, but by those who wielded the royal power ; by Henry VIII. and his minister Cromwell, by the Council of Edward VI., by Mary, by Elizabeth and her statesmen : he might have gone on to say by James I. and by Charles I., for Laud acted less as a spiritual head of the Church with the concurrence of Convocation, which in truth he treated with little consideration, than as the ecclesiastical minister of the king. The Tractarian theory of Anglican history, and of the authority by

which the doctrine and ritual was settled, is thus shown to be untenable; in fact it may be doubted whether it was ever sincerely held by its authors themselves, though they adopted it as a shield for their operations. So far as can be seen, the great body of the Clergy remained through all the revolutions and all the counter-revolutions of half-a-century reactionary at heart, in accordance with the natural tendencies of a priesthood, and were strangers to the changes which the Crown and its ministers ordained. The people, at least those in the more intelligent parts of the country, went with the king in casting off the Papal supremacy, suppressing the Monasteries, and humbling the clergy. Henry VIII. would not have dared to do what he did without the support of a large part of the nation. We think that Dr. Child underrates the force of the anti-papal and anti-monastic feeling in England before the Reformation, though he may be right in saying that the anti-papal legislation, such as the Statute of Provisors, was practically of less effect than is supposed. But what nursing-fathers and nursing-mothers for a Church were the Tudor kings and queens! What hands to have fashioned the beliefs and worship of a Christian people! There have been murderers on a larger scale than Henry VIII., but none ever murdered affection as he did when he sent Anne Boleyn to the block and married on the next day the woman to make way for whom she was butchered. The murder of More was also an unspeakably foul breach of personal friendship as well as of public justice. Dr. Child seems to think that conscience may have had something to do with the divorce of Katharine of Arragon. Has he read the king's letters to Anne Boleyn, written while the question of divorce was pending? There is, we suspect proof in the Act of Succession passed after the death of Anne Boleyn, that Henry had seduced her sister Mary, and that this was made a ground for his divorce from Anne. Cromwell not only committed judicial murders, but coolly set down in his note-book memoranda for their commission. The Council of

Edward VI. was a gang of scoundrels steeped in public plunder, conspiracy and blood. Elizabeth, besides the scandals of her court, unquestionably instigated Sir Amyas Poulett to murder Mary Queen of Scots. There is too much reason to believe that the death of Amy Robsart was no surprise to her, while it is certain that she continued her equivocal intimacy with Leicester when, to use Burleigh's words, he was "infamed by the death of his wife." Dr. Child seems to think that those were the morals of the age. If they were it must have been an age of devils. But they were not the morals of More or Pole, of Cranmer, Latimer or Hooper, of Cartwright, Travers or Browne. They were not the morals of Burleigh or other Elizabethan statesmen of the better class. Who can wonder that such men as More and Pole, having been Liberals or Reformers at first, recoiled when they saw the unity which was naturally dear to them broken, and spiritual supremacy usurped by Henry VIII. To Pole, by the way, Dr. Child, apparently following Froude, is hardly just. Pole was no bigot or fanatic, nor was he a persecutor. He was, with Sadolet and Contarini, a member of the Oratory of Divine Love, held the cardinal Protestant doctrine of Justification by Faith, and sought reconciliation on liberal terms with the Reformers. By his slackness in the Marian persecution, he incurred the suspicion of the persecuting party at Rome, and was recalled from England in disgrace. In styling him the last and best of the Roman Catholic Archbishops of Canterbury, Macaulay perhaps overshot the mark ; but he erred less widely than those who run into the other extreme. Great sympathy is due to all those moderate men who sought to reform the Church without the destruction of the Unity of Christendom. The religious wars which followed were a fearful vindication of their course.

—Mona Caird having in the *Westminster* preached the emancipation of the family, that is, its dissolution and a reign,

let us say, of unconfined affection, Mr. D. F. Hannigan now comes forward in the same review to advocate the removal of all distinction between legitimate and illegitimate children. The French Revolutionists did what he proposes, with the result which might have been expected. It is very hard, says Mr. Hannigan, like many philanthropists before him, that the child should suffer for the sins of its parents. It is still harder that the community should suffer for the sins of the child's parents as it might if the State ceased to draw distinction between the offspring of lawful marriage and of lawless lust. Mr. Hannigan says that marriage is a union of souls. Perhaps not; but it is at least a union of souls as concubinage or adultery, and claim to careful treatment as being the keystone society and the safeguard of pure affection, the heart of human happiness. Without it we should be lost of the field. When Mona Caird, or those who are in sympathy with her, play with this question they will do well to remember that marriage is a restraint placed by the stronger sex upon its own passions and that by the removal of the restraint the weaker sex would be far the greater sufferer. The male sex is not all made up of sentimentalists like those who gather round the tea-tables of *Woman's Rights*: it is full of much wilder and rougher stuff which when "emancipated" would use its liberty with a vengeance. Certain however it is that the family as well as property and authority of every kind is being assailed by the revolutionary battering-ram and is even beginning to tremble beneath its strokes. In the times that are coming people will have to be rooted in their convictions if they want to retain any part of the present order of things.

—Mr. Andrew Carnegie proclaims that a college education is fatal to business success. His challenge is answered by a number of champions of high training, and by none with more vigour and effect than by Mr. Erastus Wiman. Of Mr. Eras-

tus Wiman we suppose many Canadians have been led by persistent misrepresentation to think as a sordid schemer incapable of sympathy with anything refined and high ; yet no one ever pleaded the cause of culture better than he has done in this discussion. Mr. Andrew Carnegie is the horn-blower of "Democracy Triumphant," who thinks that the American Republic must be forty times greater than ancient Rome because the Mississippi is forty times larger than the Tiber. A high civilization we should have if he were to be the arbiter of human development ! What does he mean by business ? Almost all the great statesmen of England, and notably the great financiers from Montagu downwards, have been men of college training. The victory of Germany over France in the late war was justly described as the triumph of the Universities. Even in commercial business, when you get beyond mere routine, men of trained mind must have the advantage, as Mr. Wiman shows, over an office-boy. That a good many of the youths who now come to college had better stay away, we have already said. But the reason is that they do not avail themselves of the training. Those who do, if the training is sound, cannot fail to be better for it in any walk of life in which mind is required. Where no mind is required, or only a thievish mind, such as makes Corners and Lobbies, Mr. Andrew Carnegie's assertion may be true.

—In the *North American Review* the other day there was a Symposium on American Hatred of England. Those who maintained the existence of the feeling might have found confirmation of their view, so far as a certain section of the literary world in the United States is concerned, in Mr. Cabot Lodge's recent "Life of Washington," which contains some jets of Anglophobia singularly bitter and pre-eminently discreditable to a writer of history who binds himself in ascending the judgment-seat to leave all prejudice below. When Washington, because he is outranked by the regulars, with-

draws from the service, Mr. Lodge tells us that "the disappointment was of immense value to the American people at a later day, and there is something very instructive in the early revolt against the stupid arrogance which England has always thought it right to display towards this country. She has paid dearly for indulging it, but it has seldom cost her more than when it drove Washington from her service and left in his mind a sense of indignity and injustice." Here and throughout the volume whatever is done amiss by the English Government, or even by an individual Englishman, is ascribed to "England," and given as a specimen of the character of the British nation. The biographer, we may remark in passing, lets the cat out of the bag with regard to the motives of Washington for joining the rebellion. Undoubtedly the order as to the relative rank of regulars and provincials was wrong; and yet in this very volume is abundance of proof that it was not out of unison with Colonial feeling. In the Revolutionary War, the Americans, as Mr. Lodge himself remarks, were always apt to give European officers rank above their own. Lee, for example, we are told was much overrated, because he was an English officer among a Colonial people. Presently we come upon this paragraph: "He (Washington) also made warm friends with the English officers and was treated with consideration by his commander. The universal practice of all Englishmen was to behave contemptuously to the colonists, but there was something about Washington which made this impossible. They all treated him with the utmost courtesy, vaguely conscious that beneath the pleasant, quiet manner there was a strength of character and ability such as is rarely found; and that this was a man whom it was unsafe to offend." Discourteous behaviour to colonists was the universal practice of Englishmen: in the instance before us they behaved with perfect courtesy; that, being Englishmen, they should have done right from right motives is impossible; therefore the only way of explaining their conduct is to assume that they were actuated by fear!

In unison with the last passage is one that comes a few pages further on, "Washington had grasped instinctively the general truth that Englishmen are prone to mistake civility for servility and become offensive, whereas if they are treated with indifference, rebuke, or even rudeness, they are apt to be respectful and polite." This, we presume, is the hypothesis on which Mr. Cabot Lodge treats Englishmen when he goes among them, and then he wonders if in some unguarded moment they betray a doubt whether he is perfectly charming. And this critic of character is himself a man of British name and blood, whose not very remote ancestor was an Englishman.

We commend to the notice of our readers the spirit and taste of the following passage, as well as its fitness for insertion in a work styling itself a history: "Rude contempt for other people, is a warming and satisfying feeling, no doubt, and the English have had unquestionably great satisfaction from its free indulgence. No one should grudge it to them, least of all Americans. It is a comfort for which they have paid, so far as this country is concerned, by the loss of their North American Colonies, and by a few other settlements with the United States at other and later times. But although Washington and his army failed to impress England, events had happened in the north, during this same summer, which were so sharp-pointed that they not only impressed the English people keenly and unpleasantly, but they actually penetrated the dull comprehension of George III. and his Cabinet. 'Why,' asked an English lady of an American naval officer, in the year of grace, 1887—'why is your ship named the Saratoga?' 'Because,' was the reply, 'at Saratoga an English general and an English army of more than five thousand men surrendered to an American army, and laid down their arms.' Although apparently neglected now in the general scheme of British education, Saratoga was a memorable event in the summer of 1777, and the part taken by Washington in bringing about this great result has never, it would seem, been pro-

perly set forth." How high-bred must have been the American naval officer who thus trampled on the feelings of an English lady, guilty of nothing but unaffected ignorance of an event which after all is more present to the minds of those who daily inflate themselves with Saratoga and Yorktown than to those of mankind at large! How generous, we may add, must be the historian who can record the act with applause! It was a pity that the English lady did not know the whole of the history as well as the part which the gallant American revealed to her, or which she might learn from Mr. Cabot Lodge. She would then have been able to remind the American of the circumstances under which, and the number of forces to which, Burgoyne was forced to surrender. She might also have reminded him of the violation, on a manifestly hollow pretext, of the Saratoga Convention, and have told him that it was as flagrant a breach of faith as any recorded in military history. "Jay," said Gouverneur Morris, as he and Jay sat smoking together thirty years afterwards, "what a set of d—d scoundrels we had in that second Congress!" "Yes," said Jay, "that we had," and he knocked the ashes from his pipe. That is the seamy side which swagger provokes us to turn outwards. It will not escape notice that Mr. Cabot Lodge, in the passage just quoted, admits by implication that the American Republic has allowed hatred of England to make her disregard justice in her "settlements" with Canada. The better class of his countrymen will thank him little for his eulogies.

Again, after recounting the lawless execution of the American Captain Huddy by a party of Loyalists commanded by Captain Lippincott, in retaliation for the execution of the Loyalist Philip White, this dignified and dispassionate historian proceeds, "The deed was one of wanton barbarity, for which it would be difficult to find a parallel in the annals of modern warfare. The authors of this brutal murder, to our shame be it said, were of American birth, but they were fighting for the Crown and wore the British uniform. England,

which for generations has deafened the world with pæans of praise for her own love of fair-play and for generous humanity, stepped in here and threw the mantle of her protection over these cowardly hangmen. It has not been uncommon for wild North American savages to deliver up criminals to the vengeance of the law, but English ministers and officers condoned the murder of Huddy, and sheltered his murderers." "England"—always "England," in order that the whole people may be enveloped in the odium, though Mr. Lodge must be well aware that the English people had nothing to do with the matter, and that if the mantle of protection was thrown over murder by anybody it must have been by the commanders on the spot. But we have only to turn the page in order to see that even as regards the commanders on the spot the statement is a calumny. "Sir Guy Carleton," says Mr. Lodge himself, "who really was deeply indignant at the outrage, wrote, expressing his abhorrence, disavowed Lippincott, and promised a further inquiry." More than this, Mr. Lodge must have had Sparks before him, and Sparks says, "In the public offices of London I was favoured with all the communications of Sir Henry Clinton and Sir Guy Carleton to the Ministry on this affair of Captain Huddy, and justice requires me to say that those commanders expressed the strongest indignation and abhorrence at his execution and used every possible effort to ascertain the offenders and bring them to punishment." The court-martial before which Lippincott was sent acquitted him of murder only on the ground that he had acted not from malice but in the belief that the Board of Directors of Associated Loyalists under whom he served had authority to give the order. A full account of the affair will be found in Sabine, an American and a descendant of Whigs, but a man of generous feelings and regardful of the truth. He justly condemns the execution of Huddy but does not say "England" protects cowardly murder. Outrages without number were committed on both sides, by Whigs as well as Tories, the responsibility for which rests on the perpetrators and on the fury of civil war.

+ Of course we have the old complaint, of the want of cordiality on the part of "England" towards the United States in the years following the Revolutionary War. Suppose there was a want of cordiality, did the Americans do nothing to provoke it? What has Mr. Lodge to say about the treatment of the Loyalists? What has he to say about the violent manifestations of hatred of England borne by every packet across the Atlantic? What has he to say to the popular reception of Genet and the arming by that Jacobin scoundrel of piratical cruisers against British commerce in American ports? When the British envoy complained justly, as Mr. Lodge cannot help admitting, of the injuries done his country under the American flag and with American sympathy and encouragement, what according to Mr. Lodge himself was the attitude of the American people? They were fêting and caressing Genet, cheering and applauding him wherever he went, welcoming him with ovations and receptions. "At Philadelphia he was received," we quote Mr. Lodge himself, "by a great concourse of citizens called together by the guns of the very privateer which had violated neutrality." These things England was to take as tokens of American goodwill and proofs of American perfection, which called for the utmost cordiality and for all sorts of compliments in response. Towards Washington who behaved with decency England did show cordiality in return, and the flags of the British fleet under Lord Bridport were half-masted at his death. This Hildreth mentions. Mr. Lodge admits Hildreth's trustworthiness: why did he suppress the fact?

+ A better spirit is rapidly prevailing over that of Elijah Program in American historians, and writers not a few worthy of their high calling have appeared, Mr. Parkman heading the list. But the improvement has not yet reached all American historians or biographers, and it certainly has not reached Mr. Cabot Lodge. A few Englishmen, we are sorry to say, still write in the same ignoble strain, but no author of mark is of the number.

—The “Franklin,” which follows “Washington” in the series of “American Statesmen,” is in a much better key. Its writer, Mr. John T. Morse, jr., is not far from the view which, as we believe, will prevail in the end, that the quarrel between the Mother Country and the Colonies was the consequence of a false situation, rather than of tyranny on the part of the Mother Country; that its immediate cause was far from being one which could justify a civil war; that there were faults upon both sides; that if the King was obstinate, there was also at Boston a party resolved from the beginning against reconciliation; and that the quarrel was in itself and in its consequences a deplorable affair. An American writer must be thoroughly open-minded and judicial who can say that Grenville, “in protesting that he was acting from a real regard and tenderness towards the Americans, spoke in perfect good faith, that his views both of the law and the reasons for the law, were intelligent and honest, that he had carefully gathered information and sought advice, and that he had a profound belief alike in the righteousness and the wisdom of the measure.”

Franklin's love of the Mother Country, which was intense is a conclusive proof that her government, though faulty, was not tyrannical; while the esteem in which he was held, and the respect with which he was treated in the highest English circles, shows that, though Colonial dependence necessarily involves inferiority and is a bad system on that account, the insolent contempt of the people of the Imperial Country for Colonists has been greatly overstated by American writers. Franklin was the man who could best have acted as mediator. He had begun in fact, to play that part, when there came the fatal incident of the stolen letters, followed by the disastrous scene before the Privy Council. Wedderburn is truly called by Mr. Morse one of the meanest of England's lawyers. He was one of the low Scotch adventurers, too common in those days, and twice his vileness brought great calamities on the country; once by estranging Franklin, and a second time by inducing the King to veto Catholic Emancipation. It must be

owned, on the other hand, that Franklin's conduct with regard to the letters could not well be defended in the court of honour, though it might be palliated by the patriotic motive; and it was specially offensive to the English gentlemen who though loose in their morals, and often politically corrupt, had still a keen sense of honour. However, it is more than doubtful whether even Franklin's mediation would have been effectual. Samuel Adams and his party, we take it, were resolved from the beginning on Independence. It is unlikely that any concessions would have ultimately availed.

Franklin's own idea of the connection between the Colony and the Mother Country was that it should be one not of dependence but of perfect equality. "An equal dispensation of protection, rights, privileges and advantages is what every part is entitled to and ought to enjoy, it being a matter of no moment to the State whether a subject grows rich and flourishing on the Thames or on the Ohio, in Edinburgh or Dublin." This, Mr. Morse calls a broad and liberal doctrine, and he is sorry that it could be accepted by no Englishman then living. It was however accepted by Adam Smith, who proposed that the Colonies should have a representation, and of course he meant a fair representation, in the Imperial Parliament. The objections to that plan were set forth by Burke, and on no other could there be real equality. If the Imperial Parliament was to be sovereign, it followed that the Colonies must be dependent. On the other hand, were the Colonies to contribute their proportion to Imperial armaments, and to shoulder their share of the debt which had been contracted for joint aggrandizement or defence? If they were not, and if the whole burden was to be thrown on the Mother Country, it could scarcely be said that the Mother Country enjoyed an equality of advantage and protection, 'Colonial self-government has a fair sound, but what does it mean, when carried fully into effect, except that the Imperial Country is to resign all its power and retain the whole of the responsibility? Into this arrangement we have now slid, but had it been definitely proposed a

hundred years ago it could scarcely have found acceptance with any British statesman. The relation of the Colonists to their Mother Country founded on the feudal notion of inde-feasible personal allegiance was from the outset radically false, and was pretty sure to end in some catastrophe, such as that which produced a schism in our race, and for a century has made the two sections of it strangers, if not enemies, to each other. A quarrel which was the work of evil destiny, all right-minded men will study to bury and forget.

—Mr. D. B. Read's "Life and Times of Governor Simcoe" (Toronto: Geo. Virtue) opportunely appears at a time when, after the fashion of youthful communities in the New World, our people are beginning to look forward to the first centennial anniversary of the founding of Upper Canada. Unluckily for the biographer, there is not much material to make a book, at least as regards Simcoe's administration of affairs in the Province. The author has therefore had recourse to the Governor's military career during the Revolutionary War, while in command of the "Queen's Rangers," that notable, irregular corps, part infantry, part light horse, which did the King good service in the war with the insurgent colonists, and, later on, furnished material for the loyalist settlement of Upper Canada. To those already familiar with Simcoe's narrative of his campaigns, in 1778-81, this portion of the work will lack the interest of a fresh story, though probably few possess the "Journal." What there is to relate regarding the beginnings of civil government in Upper Canada, Mr. Read has related. Even the section dealing with this subject, however, has had to be eked out with a review of the incidents connected with the passing in the Imperial Parliament of the Constitutional Act of 1791, which set apart Upper Canada from the old French Province. Beyond this, the chief local interest centres in the brief chapters dealing with the "First Parliament of Upper Canada" and the "Establishing of the

Capital at York." As a sequel to these, we have, at the close of the book, a chapter reciting the incidents connected with the "Governor's Last Days in Canada." The intervening portion of the work gives an account of tours in the Western Peninsula (to the Thames, a rival for the honours of the capital, and to Detroit), of the opening of communication inland from Lake Ontario, and of a visit to the Mohawks, to whose chief, Joseph Brant, the Governor paid the homage due to a brave and staunch ally of Britain. Mr. Read's work is a modest, painstaking narrative; all that was to be told it tells with soberness and truth.

—The "Protestant Episcopal Layman's Handbook" (Toronto: Hart & Co.) contains many smooth stones out of the brook which will be handy for any slinger whose mark is the High Church Goliath. The section on Bishops will be pleasant reading for the proud wearers of the mitre. On the whole, however, the list of Episcopal scandals is not long, and the worst belong to the times of general corruption, the Restoration and the middle of the last century. Perhaps the most startling of them is that of Blackburn, Walpole's "jolly old Archbishop of York," who "won more hearts than souls," and who was believed in his youth to have been associated with pirates. The Church of England narrowly escaped Sterne. The Duke of York, it is true, held the Bishopric of Osnaburgh, but this was a secularized See, while his Grace was certainly a highly secularized Bishop.

N.S., No. 12.

SEPTEMBER,
1890.

{ 10c. Single Number.
\$1.00 per year, *post paid*.

A MONTHLY
REVIEW

THE BYSTANDER

OF
CURRENT EVENTS,
CANADIAN AND GENERAL.

CONTENTS.

PAGE.	PAGE.
The Tariff Question 377	European Affairs 391
The Attitude of Our Government .. 379	The Potato Blight in Ireland .. 392
The Report of a Dissolution .. 380	Lord Coleridge on Journalism .. 392
Surrendering to the Papacy .. 381	The Cession of Heligoland .. 393
The Commercial Situation .. 382	The Spread of Socialism .. 394
The Exodus 384	The Criminal Class 396
Mortgage Debt in Ontario .. 385	Electrocution 397
Salaries and Nepotism .. 386	Anglophobia 398
Libel Suits 387	John Henry Newman 400
High Schools 387	John Ruskin 402
General Middleton's Address .. 388	Prof. Corson on Shakespeare .. 404
Mutiny in England 390	Literary Journalism in Ontario .. 407

Toronto:

HUNTER, ROSE & COMPANY, 25 WELLINGTON ST.,

PUBLISHERS.

WHOLESALE AGENTS

Digitized by Google

TORONTO NEWS CO., TORONTO.

MONTREAL NEWS CO., MONTREAL.

JOS. M. SORLEY, •

TELEPHONE 1398

Real Estate Broker,

39 ADELAIDE ST. EAST.

I NVITES the attention of the public to call and examine his List of Properties, of which the following are specially recommended as being extra good investments :

Mimico, 600 feet on the Janes Survey, \$8.00 per foot,

North Toronto, 1,128 feet on Glenwood Ave., \$7.50 per foot.

" " 96 feet on Yonge Street, \$22.00 per foot.

Brockton Addition, 240 feet Mackenzie Ave., \$25.00 per foot.

" " 232 feet on Cooper Ave., \$24.00 per foot.

" " block of 1,034 feet on Royce, Albert, Longfellow and Lappin Ave's., \$20.00 per foot.

Rosedale. 150 feet on Gordon Ave., \$45.00 per foot.

Toronto Annex, lots on all streets from \$37.50 to \$100 per foot

Loans Negotiated.

Investments Made.

Rents Collected.

JOS. M. SORLEY,

TELEPHONE 1398.

39 ADELAIDE ST. EAST.

Come and See + +

+ + the Latest Novelty

ONLY TO BE SEEN AT

Bruce's Photo. Art Studio,

132 King Street West

(OPP. ROSSIN HOUSE.)

Beautiful Permanent Pictures.

Portraits or Views on Silk or Linen,

NOW ALL THE FASHION.

GET YOUR HANDKERCHIEFS DECORATED.

GUARANTEED TO STAND WASHING.

THE BYSTANDER.

SEPTEMBER, 1890.

IN the fiscal region the clouds, heavy as they look, are decidedly breaking, both here and in the United States. At the time of our writing the McKinley Bill seems sure to pass, possibly with a breach in its principle made by the reduction of the duty on barley. But to buy its passage, its framers have been compelled virtually to abandon the Force Bill, and they would hardly have deemed that compromise necessary if they had not known that the obstruction with which the Democrats threatened their Tariff Bill would have had public opinion to back it. Before the McKinley Bill left the House for the Senate it had been seriously scarred by the protest of Mr. Butterworth which drew forth expressions of sympathy from all parts of the Union. Mr. Blaine, the Republican chief, is declaring for the principle of Reciprocity, and is at open war with the hoggish monopolism of Mr. Reed. He applies his principle at present only to the relations with the South American Republics, but the McKinleyites see plainly enough that in its scope it comprehends all quarters of the compass. Mr. Blaine is not a manufacturer, and he is the shrewdest, if not the most scrupulous, man of his party. He discerns that the game of keeping alive war-passions for the purpose of sustaining the war-tariff approaches its end, and that when it comes to wasting surplus revenue in pensions, to the extent of a hundred and thirty millions a year, besides squandering other public money, for the purpose of staving off reduction, the sufferance of the people is likely to be pretty well ex-

hausted. The McKinley Bill was not directed against Canada: it was an attempt to give the American farmer an apparent interest in protection, and it is a proof of consciousness on the part of its framers that the farmer, slow as is his intelligence and fast-set as he is in his party lines, begins to see through the fraud which has long been practised on him, and to suspect that he is paying for the manufacturer's gains. Among the leading manufacturers themselves, some, we are assured, are becoming aware that the system cannot last, and will subscribe to the bribery fund no more. Mr. Dawes, the Massachusetts Senator, declares for free iron and coal. New England, her monopoly having been fatally infringed by other States, both West and South, whose competition the monopolist likes just as little as that of the foreigner, is now herself coming to reason, and it would not be surprising to see her before long pass over openly to the side of Free Trade. Under the heading "light from Kansas," American journals are reproducing a remarkable editorial from the *Champion*, a leading journal of Kansas, which is the banner Republican State. The *Champion* formally avows its conversion to Tariff Reform and its renunciation of Protection, which it has hitherto supported, but which it finds to be a fraud, enriching the East only by impoverishing the West. Wherever you turn in the United States you find signs of a movement of opinion. Cleveland, it should be remembered, though he missed the Presidency, had a popular majority over Harrison, and it was only bad tactics on his part, combined with a lavish use of money in corruption by the monopolists, that prevented his re-election. Yes, the clouds are breaking: the night of monopoly is far spent; the day of liberation is at hand. It is the day of liberation for industry as well as for commerce; for how without the free disposal of the products of industry can industry itself be free? We repeat that the McKinley Bill is a measure of internal policy, not of hostility to Canada, while Mr. Hitt's Resolution pointing to Commercial Union, though its progress has been blocked by other business, is so far from

having been laid aside that the framer looks forward to pushing it, as soon as he has the opportunity, with full confidence in its ultimate success.

—Our own Protectionist Government has been confronted by the same necessity as the McKinleyites, and has met it in the same way. The farmer here, as in the United States, is beginning to see through the imposture and to perceive that he is the sheep whom everybody is shearing. Something must be done to make him think that he has an interest in Protection. In the Tariff Act there was a standing offer to the Americans of reciprocity in natural products. This, and the avowal of principle which it embodies, are now shamelessly thrown over and farm products are subjected to protective duties in the pretended interest of the farmer. Nothing more than this somersault was needed to show that the object of the Government in its fiscal policy is party victory, not the material welfare of the people. Thus politicians play their game and the people pay for it. Protectionism itself was adopted by Sir John Macdonald and Sir Charles Tupper manifestly from a political motive. Both of them were for Reciprocity till after the election of 1878. Sir John Macdonald's watchword was Reciprocity of Trade or Reciprocity of Tariffs, implying that he was for Reciprocity of Trade if he could get it. Up to the time of the election he expressly disclaimed Protection, declaring that his policy was not Protection but Re-adjustment. He embraced Protection only when he saw, or thought that he saw, that the manufacturers' vote and the manufacturers' funds would carry elections for him and keep him in power. He will go into the next contest with great advantages on his side; with the influence of a party long entrenched in office, and with an election fund swelled not only by manufacturers' subscriptions, contracts, government grants for works, and such aid as he may draw from the C. P. R., but by the subsidies to Provinces, which a fatal blunder in our

Constitution permits, and of which promises will no doubt be lavishly held forth. But Tariff Reform has in its favour, we feel assured, a great preponderance of opinion as well as the manifest interest of the community. If the people can only be got in any tolerable measure to vote as they think, Dagon will come down.

—A belief prevails that the next session at Ottawa will be early and short, and that it will at once be followed by a dissolution, the Prime Minister thinking that the time has come again for snapping a verdict. Perhaps he deems the moment favourable while the irritation caused by the McKinley Bill is fresh and before the pressure of that measure and of his own equally noxious policy has been felt. We heartily concur in the protest which some of our contemporaries are raising, and which we have ourselves more than once raised, against this abuse of the prerogative of dissolution. It is a manifest violation of popular right, the Constitution having empowered the people to elect their representatives for a term of five years; it is destructive of the independence of Parliament, which is thus made to sit with the sword of a penal dissolution always hanging over its head; and it may be employed to perpetuate in power, by tricky trading on circumstances comparatively accidental, a Government which has lost the settled confidence of the country. Parliament, unless close to the end of its legal term, ought to be dissolved only when a constitutional crisis renders it impossible to carry on the Government without an appeal to the people. Such is still the doctrine of the best constitutional authorities even in England where the restraining force of tradition and the more responsible character of the statesmen would make an unlimited power of dissolution less dangerous than it is here. In spite of all the vaunts of democracies about their freedom, their servility is sometimes astounding. Let the power of intrigue or corruption once get them down and it may do pretty much what it likes with

them. Is it not enough that a Prime Minister should be allowed to fill one branch of the Legislature with his personal retainers, and virtually to barter seats in it for contributions to his election fund, but the other must be reduced to a mere creature of his will by making its tenure dependent not on the law but on his pleasure? The Governor-General, it is alleged, can do nothing to guard public right: he must obey without questioning the order of his nominal servant. Such was not the view taken at all events by Sir Edmund Head. If it be the true view, we can only express our wonder that any British nobleman, when he can live in honour at home, should think it worth his while to come here merely for the purpose of lending his name and his ostensible authority as a sanction and mask for the practices of unscrupulous politicians.

—The attention of Equal Rights men is exultingly called by the Liberal allies of Ultramontaniam to the dealings of the British Government with the Pope, and especially to the announcement which is stated to have appeared that Cardinal Manning is to take rank as a matter of courtesy after the princes of the blood and before the Lord Chancellor and the Anglican Prelates. We are tauntingly asked what we have to say to this. What we have to say is that if the announcement is true the nation is dishonored. When it is remembered that the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill was always believed to have been passed specially to satisfy the indignation of the Queen herself at Papal aggression, we may measure the humiliation which the Court undergoes. We are desired at the same time to note that the British Government has accredited an envoy to the Pope, though the Pope is no longer a political sovereign. We do observe it, and we pronounce it a policy as weak as it is ignominious and a dereliction of principle, which is sure, like all derelictions of principle, to recoil upon its authors. In politics, we say once more, the name

of priest is perfidy, as all will find who seek his treacherous aid. It is a day of shame for England when she owns that to preserve order in her realm and save the Union from disruption she is fain to crave the assistance of a foreign priest. It is precisely against the policy of this sort that the friends of Equal Rights here have taken up arms, which they do not mean to lay down, let who will waver or turn tail. The wretched necessities of the British Government with its rebel Ireland are not ours. We have a word of warning to address to the quarter from which this taunting appeal comes. The leaders of the Liberal party know well that in consenting to the endowment of Jesuitism and in supporting Separate Schools they are bartering Liberal principles for the French and Catholic vote. They might at least have the grace to be silent and to abstain from forcing their apostasy upon our notice. This, prudence as well as decency enjoins on them. They are on the eve of a struggle in which they will unquestionably have to contend against formidable influences, and will need every vote they can muster. There are people who prize very highly the advantages of free trade with the Continent but who prize still more highly the great organic principles of our moral civilization; and common as indifference to principle may be, there are probably enough of these "fanatics" in not a few constituencies to turn the scale even by abstention. The worst thing that can possibly happen in the eyes of a genuine Liberal is the advent of false Liberals to power. The Equal Rights movement has triumphed in the North-West and wrested from priestly rule that realm of promise: it has no intention of dying here, however convenient to the Machinists its death might be.

—The dullest summer's business known for many years is the report of the country store-keeper, not a few of whom have had to cast the burden on their creditors, by whom debts have been compromised, sometimes in forgetfulness of the stern fact

that the overcrowded ranks will have to be thinned. Large importations from abroad, overproduction at home, and facility of bank accommodation lead to laxness in crediting and unsoundness. Had the harvest been bad there might have been a crash. Happily the harvest is good. Yet the farmer will not have much to spare. In addition to interest on mortgages, the insidious vendors of parlour organs, sewing machines, patent churns, beehives, washing machines, and notions of all kinds, willing to sell for a promissory note at a long date, have been busy and their notes have to be met before the store-bill can be paid. Shareholders in cotton mills have little reason to bless the Protection which has turned capital into unproductive channels, and English capitalists are little inclined to take such unpromising investments on their hands. At least three mills are in liquidation, and of the remaining twenty-one not more than two or three are paying dividends in spite of the combine. Combines are the order of the day. Among them are one to keep up the price of salt, one to keep up the price of agricultural implements, and one to keep up the price of imported plate glass. For the lumberman the prospect, bright in the spring, has since become dull. The lumber business is sluggish both in the home and foreign markets, and the South American field has been almost closed this year. The business is mostly in the hands of firms enriched by former operations which can tide over a dull year. Yet it cannot suffer without evil consequences to thousands engaged in this industry or dependent on it. The pressure for money has enabled the banks to employ all their available funds during the summer at good rates, and values of stocks generally have improved under the influence of a bull movement inspired by good harvest prospects and high prices for grain. The land boom in Toronto happily is over and the inflow of money from a distance has ceased. There is as yet little shrinkage in values, and speculators in suburban property, if they can afford to hold, may yet come off scatheless. The bricklayers' strike was a blessing in disguise, as it checked the speculative building. There are

too many vacant houses, but the winter influx of residents may reduce their number. If Toronto grows, however, it is at the expense of the smaller towns. We must not forget that British money has been pouring in, and its incoming, while it gives a stimulus and creates an appearance of prosperity for the time is in the end an increase of debt.

—It was not THE BYSTANDER but the Government Report which said that the value of farm property in Ontario had fallen thirty-three per cent, though we have verified the statement for ourselves and believe it to be not at all over the mark. We are told that land in New England, also, has fallen off in value, that many farms there are being deserted, and that there is a migration from those districts as well as an exodus from Canada. This is true; but the soil of much of New England was poor from the beginning and has been largely worked out, whereas the soil of Ontario is good and has been comparatively little worked out. Besides the United States do not lose the men, who only move from the Eastern to the Western parts of the country, as people are moving from the rural districts to the towns in Great Britain, whereas Canada does lose the men, and to a nation which Loyalists always describe as hostile. The emigrants, it should be observed, leave just at the age when their value is the highest, after the country has been at the expense of rearing them. A local journal finds that it has three hundred subscribers on the other side of the line, and believes that in fifteen years it must have lost a thousand in that way, while in the county in which it is published, and which is one of our choicest, population had been almost at a standstill. We commend this to the attention of Government organists when next they seek to console Ontario for its losses by pointing to those of New England. The fact is that the present system of government in this country owes its continuance in no small measure to the constant elimination of the most active and inde-

pendent spirits by the exodus, of which the policy of the Government is largely the cause. We say largely, not wholly; there are other causes at work; but the main cause, where the land is good and not worked out, is a policy which precludes the farmer from either selling or buying in the best market and at the same time prevents the development of the natural resources of the country. If our mineral wealth could be developed, the farmer would have a larger population to feed, and he would not have to pay for its creation as he has to pay for the creation of any additional number of consumers offered him by Protection. But how can the mines be worked without a market for the ore and without liberty to import machinery? "Develop our mineral resources," Restrictionists cry; as though any resources could be developed when the products cannot be sold.

—Our lively contemporary, the *Bobcaygeon Independent*, ascribes agricultural depression to mortgage debt, and describes the farmer as toiling only to feed a "privileged" and non-producing class. This language surely is strong. Whatever there may be in feudal communities, there cannot be said to be any privileged class in a community like ours. If the lists of the shareholders in the Loan Societies were published they would be found to contain people of all classes, including a good many of the farmers themselves. Nor have we many non-producers unless that term is applied, as the labour journals are apt to apply it, to all who do not work with their hands. A civilization sustained only by people who worked with their hands, our contemporary will admit, would not be high. If a man wants to improve or stock a farm and has not the money, he must borrow; and if he borrows he must pay. We believe it will be found that taking any large area the value of the properties has been increased by the money put into them far beyond the amount of the loan. Of course if the prices of produce fall and the value of the land falls with them

the weight of the debt increases in proportion, and this, we fear, is now the case. Moreover, there is danger from the redundancy of capital seeking investment in mortgage, and especially from the mass of British capital which has been pouring in of late years. The rival Loan Societies in their effort to get out their money can hardly fail sometimes to thrust it unduly on the farmer. So long as the borrower comes to the lender you are pretty safe, but when the lender solicits the borrower peril begins. So far, we believe, the number of foreclosures compared with that of loans has been very small.

—Curious inquirers have been reckoning up the salaries of the Tupper family and profess to find that the aggregate charge amounts to as much per head of the Canadian population as the cost of the British monarchy to the population per head of Great Britain! Suppose it did; if work is done and well done there is no ground for complaint. The salaries of our public servants are too low and their relationships do not add to the cost. Provided there are no illegitimate gains we may pay the regular salaries without grudging. The amount which the whole Tupper family is alleged to receive from the public is not much more than is paid to a single member of the British Cabinet. The High Commissionership in itself is we venture to think an office of doubtful utility to this country; it is a pipe through which partisan views of an extreme kind about Canada and her affairs are being always poured into the British Government and the British public. But the pay considering the expensiveness of London society is not too high. As to our official stipends, we repeat, there is no ground for complaint. What is really objectionable is the indefinite gain made by nepotistic influence or by a monopoly of backstairs business with government departments. Nor is it well that the son of a Minister, and of a Minister of Railways, should be in receipt of a large salary from a railway which is an applicant to the Government for legislative favour. Wages we

should be glad to see reasonably raised, if we could be sure that other emoluments would be foregone.

—Mr. John King pleads for the better protection of journals against vexatious libel suits brought by irresponsible plaintiffs. His plea is just, though libel unfortunately is not the only legal field in which we are exposed to litigation at the hands of people who cannot pay the costs. But there is also something to be said on behalf of those whose reputation is exposed to the attacks of journalists trading in libel and enabled to defy its penalties by their lack both of character and of cash. People need not greatly tax their memory to recall flagrant instances of this kind in our own community. It is said that such libels may be safely treated with contempt. General abuse may be safely treated with contempt; but it is doubtful whether a specific charge can: it is remembered and repeated when its source is forgotten. Citizens have a right to reputation, and that right is at present not in all cases effectually guarded. Perhaps to guard it effectually in the case of public men, so long as a jury is the tribunal, would hardly be possible. One of the most eminent of Canadian judges was heard to say that in the trial of a libel suit brought by a party politician, no efforts of the presiding judge could secure justice against appeals to the political prejudice of the jury. The result of a system which morally constrains the plaintiff in a libel suit to go into the witness box too commonly is that instead of the libeller being tried for libel the man libelled is tried for his general character. A journal ought not to be allowed to bring charges without evidence, and then wring out evidence from the accused person himself by cross-examination: it ought to be compelled to make good the charges with evidence of its own. Honourable journalism would be no gainer by a lax law of libel.

—Education has been holding its summer meetings. Our parting word to it shall be, Improve the High Schools. More

than once we have expressed the conviction that at the High Schools the education of youths destined for business or ordinary callings ought as a rule to end. It is a mistake to bring on to the University any boy who has no aptitude for learning or science and there practically bid him work or be idle as he chooses, with too many chances in favour of his being idle. If we are right in this, the High School is for youths in general the finishing-place of education, and its importance and that of its headmaster are great. Improve the High Schools, get thoroughly good men for the headships and masterhips, and, that the incomes may be such to draw ability, increase the fees, which are now absurdly small, to a reasonable amount, retaining perhaps a few places as bursaries for pupils from the Public Schools. Let the High Schools be perfectly organized and used as places of Secondary Education for the community at large, not, as is too much the case at present, employed merely to qualify teachers, male and female, for the Public Schools. From the Report of the recent Departmental Examinations, it would seem, that considerably over three-fourths of the candidates make use of the High Schools for the means of professional training, two-thirds of the number being women; and the same thing, we believe, happens every year.

—A perusal of General Middleton's Parting Address will we are sure convince any fair-minded reader that the General's crime was nothing worse than a blunder, the chief responsibility for which moreover rests not on the military commander but on the civil assessor whom the Government placed at his side, and whom if the members of the Parliamentary Committee had been intent on justice, they would not have failed to call before them. The indictment against the General, as his Address says, comprised four particular charges, which were put forward by Mr. Lister, M.P., as a series collectively sustaining the general charge of peculation and connivance at pillage. Of these the Committee at once dropped three, ostensibly be-

cause they had no authority to investigate them, but really knowing that there was not a shadow of ground for anyone of them; if it was authority that they wanted they might have had it by stepping across the hall. The spoil which, had the General's hasty and ill-advised order about mementoes taken effect, would have fallen to his own share was not furs to the value of \$5,000, as his traducers assert; but a fraction of one-eighth of a lot, about the value of which he could know nothing, and the whole of which probably was not worth half \$5,000. Does anybody believe that he would sully his reputation and risk professional ruin for such a piece of pelf as this? A British officer, in a country where he had few friends, some enemies, and we fear not any very good adviser, without skill in fence of tongue or pen, having his character made the sport of politicians whose motives were too apparent, was an object of natural sympathy to men who would abhor the thought of apologizing for dishonour. The politician with whom charges of corruption and malversation are the every-day weapons of party warfare, and who by familiarity has grown callous to them, hardly knows what a wound they inflict upon a soldier's breast. It is surprising that any Canadian who wears a uniform should have failed to feel for the General in the cruel position in which he was placed. The question whether the command ought to be held by an Englishman or a Canadian was perfectly irrelevant and its introduction could only serve to pervert justice. Happily it signifies little who commands, as there is not the slightest chance of war with the only nation which would be likely to attack us on land; otherwise our troops would run no small risk of immolation on the altar of Nativism if they were to be commanded by a native general who had never seen service or perhaps handled a brigade. If there is any question about payment for the furs the responsibility surely rests upon the Government, through its agent Mr. Hayter Reed; not that anybody, so far as we can see, has very much to answer for. If a man renounces the protection of the Government and its laws by going into a rebel

camp, his goods and chattels must take their chance; and there was against Bremner, as General Middleton shows, a strong *prima facie* case. The country will hereafter look back on this affair with anything but pride.

—There have now been three mutinies in the British army, once the paragon of discipline and duty. At the same time there have been disturbances in the English police. If the public force were to become untrustworthy utter confusion would set in, and it will be surprising if the prospect of such a catastrophe does not make even faction pause. In his eagerness to bring back the reign of the political Messiah, to which he regards any other government as an unhallowed obstacle, Mr. Gladstone has filled the country with anarchical as well as with disunionist sentiment and set the spirit of disturbance everywhere at work. People in England are beginning to compare the state of the army with that of the French army in 1789, and to fear a repetition of the same train of events. The case is not so bad as that; yet it must be owned that there are some ugly traits of similarity between the condition of England at the present hour and that of France on the eve of the great deluge. One of them is the growing hatred of all authority. Another is the levity with which people of the higher and wealthier class seem to be dabbling in revolution, and which reminds us of Philippe Egalité and the doomed triflers of his train. In the case of Philippe, vanity, the satiety of pleasure, and the desire of a new excitement were the moving causes: in the case of the English there is mingled with these perhaps an impulse of a higher kind; but the social symptom is not the less alarming. Together with mutiny there is industrial war on the largest and most menacing scale. Professional incendiaries are licensed to indulge their malignant ambition by throwing a whole section of the realm into confusion, paralysing trade, wrecking or depreciating a vast amount of property, and depriving thousands for a time of

their bread, besides breaking up social order and poisoning the heart of the community. Soon it will become a question how far society is bound to suffer its most vital interests to be the sport of agitators like these. The House of Commons adjourns after a session lost in obstruction and marked in ever-increasing measure by factious violence, disorder and even outrage. Nor is there the slightest reason for hoping that this assembly, now the depositary of supreme power and in effect the sole government of the nation, will meet again in any better temper or more fitted to legislate and rule. Too little is seen anywhere of the courage of conviction: the sinew of the nation seems to have been unstrung for the time by scepticism and the failure of the beliefs on which character has hitherto been formed and action based. Hardly any man of mark, except Mr. Balfour, comes forward on either side: and when Mr. Gladstone is gone, if the Radicals win, we may see the destinies of the greatest of nations committed to Sir William Harcourt, Mr. Labouchere, and Mr. John Morley. However, there is still great store of force in England and national peril may bring it forth.

—The opinion seems to gain ground that there is a secret understanding between France and Russia. If there is, there will most likely be war, for such an understanding can have no peaceful object. On the other side will apparently be a firm union of England and Germany cemented by Lord Salisbury's diplomacy, the success of which even Home Rulers are compelled to acknowledge. With them will be Austria, thanks to the wise moderation which Bismarck knew how, on occasion, to unite with daring. From the field of Sadowa the Stephans-thurm was almost in view, and the victorious army cried, "On to Vienna!" But Bismarck at once called a halt. Having rid Germany of Austrian domination he took from Austria not a rood of land, he subjected her pride to no sort of humiliation. Thus of his defeated enemy he made at once a fast friend. If

the old hero shows less calmness than we could desire in his fall, let it be remembered that not only has he lost power but he sees his work in danger of being undone by the rashness of an unbalanced youth. To make matters worse, the youth, it seems, has now fallen under the influence of an intriguing woman, the organ of a family grudge against the statesman who, in making Germany a nation, had to discrown the King of Hanover. The young George III., Bute and the Princess Dowager cashiered Chatham, but their act has not been ratified by national gratitude.

—The sad news seems to be true that there is going once more to be a potato blight, with disease as usual in its train, over part at least of Ireland. Thus, while politicians are wrangling about their Land Tenure Bills and their Home Rule projects, the finger of nature points to the fundamental evil. The Celt is not a farmer, in the proper sense of the term, in Ireland any more than he is here. His crop is the potato, grown with little toil, the treacherous plant of indolence and thriftlessness. Upon this he heedlessly multiplies till its periodical failure brings famine. What change of land laws or political institutions can cure this? Under the same laws and institutions, with the very same political relations to Great Britain, the Teuton of Ulster is a prosperous man.

—Lord Coleridge has been fluttering the British Press by warning his friends against blind deference to the opinion of journalists. He says he has known many journalists and that if they had talked to you over a dinner table you would have thought nothing of them. The criterion is characteristic of a famous diner-out. A man may be silent or dull in company and yet be a great statesman or publicist. Lord Coleridge has an easy task in arguing that blind deference ought to be paid to the opinion of no man or journal. He may also do good by admonishing people to clear their minds of all false glamour

belonging to the editorial "We," and take the editorial for what it is worth. But he will hardly deny that used not as oracles but as helps to political thought and sources of political information the editorials of the London Press are worth a good deal. They are worth at least as much as most of the speeches in Parliament, which in truth are reproductions of the editorials. The Press has superseded Parliament as the forum of national debate. A man who reads only one paper and treats it as his oracle is a slave: in the rural districts there are still such people; but in the cities most men see two papers. Among the educated class the power of the Press, moreover, is now divided with the daily journals by the magazines. On the whole we are pretty well guarded against journalistic dictatorship. Ontario suffered from it twenty years ago: she now suffers from it no more. The serious question—one of the most serious for civilization—is, what is behind the Press? How many journals are there which are free from clandestine influences alien to the common weal? If Lord Coleridge would turn his inquiries that way he might be of great service to the State.

—The cession of Heligoland is as minute a thing of the kind as there could be, but the point of a pin suffices to prick a bladder, and the cession when it is seen to be followed by no bad consequences to the prestige any more than to the strength of England may suffice to put an end to the notion that her greatness depends on her blind and unreasoning retention of everything which by any means and under any circumstances has come into her hands. A general who, finding his lines too much extended, should make it a point of honour not to contract them would show as much good sense as those who protest in the name of national pride against the abandonment of a dependency which has ceased to be a source of strength and become a mere source of danger. What can be more ridiculous than Lord Rosebery, vapouring in the high Imperialist strain

about Heligoland while he is conspiring with Mr. Parnell and the Clan-na-Gael to break up the United Kingdom? In fact, a great deal of the exaggerated Imperialism now afloat in England is salve for the honour of those who would surrender Ireland to Parnell. They seek to delude themselves and the country by pretending that the sacrifice of union at home is to be merged in the ampler and grander union of a Confederate Empire. England has repeatedly ceded by treaties of peace conquests made in war and has been none the worse for the transaction. She has ceded two kingdoms, for her kings long bore the title Kings of France, and one of them was for a few years King of Corsica. Her strength lies in herself; her weakness lies in distant and defenceless dependencies: to this conviction when the reign of gasconade is over her statesmen will return and Heligoland will not be the last useless and exposed outpost from which they will draw back their forces to guard the heart of the Empire.

—A writer in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* speaks of the astonishing spread of Socialism. Every one now, he says, calls himself a Socialist. This would be startling news, and we should think that society was coming to a grand crash or to a grand transformation, if Socialism were not so equivocal a term. What the Socialist proper seeks is a forcible redistribution of property, together with a confiscation of industrial liberty, which would probably carry with it other liberty, by the State. We doubt whether there is one person among ten thousand in France or in any other country who seriously believes this to be either practicable or desirable. No man at all events can suppose that it could be brought about without the most desperate of civil wars. But the term Socialism is used in the most equivocal manner. It is applied, as we before had occasion to remark, to mere extensions of the powers of government in the field which already belongs to it. It is applied to Factory Acts, to Liquor Legislation, to sanitary

reforms, to compulsory education, and a number of other measures, not one of which, we repeat, is so Socialistic as the law requiring us to keep the seventh day as a day of rest. Each of these measures ought to be discussed on its own merits and with reference to the needs and aptitudes of the particular community. It is quite conceivable that there may still be a number of matters which can better be settled by collective than by individual action. As to this there are only two things to be said; first, that man, having after a struggle of ages against kings and priests won a certain portion of liberty and some power of self-development, we do not want to see him at once deprived of either by tyrannical philanthropists; and secondly, that before we give the State much larger powers we should like to know who is to be the State.

To talk of Christian Socialism seems absurd and somewhat Jesuitical, though the phrase was invented we believe by Frederick Maurice, one of the best and most beneficent of men. Christianity has nothing to do with Socialism. The primitive Church of Jerusalem, though its members had all things in common, was not Socialistic. It did not question the right of property. Ananias's field, as Peter told him, was his own until he chose to bring it into the common stock. Nothing is more certain than that the Church in becoming the religion of the Empire accepted the institution of property, whatever rhetorical passages against wealth or the claims of its possessor may be culled from the declamations of the Fathers. Nor were the fraternities of Monks Socialistic. They held the corporate property in common, but they maintained the right of the abbey against all outsiders. Property and liberty, with duty and charity, may be said to be the doctrine of the Christian Church, which looks to the gradual ascendancy of duty and charity over selfishness in the use of property and liberty for the social transformation which the Parisian Socialist seeks to bring about at once and by sharper instruments. So far the Church though slower in her processes may fairly be said to have been surer than the Jacobins. The Socialist proper is not

to be cajoled by the phrase Christian Socialism. He knows very well that Christianity is his enemy. It destroys his motive power by teaching that happiness is spiritual, not material, and by bidding men look forward to another life. It discredits his method by commending as the great instrument of improvement not revolution but self-reform.

—A work of some interest has just appeared on the Criminal Class by Mr. Havelock Ellis. The writer, rather in his own despite, proves that there is no such thing as a criminal class in the sense of a class by nature predestined to crime. Neither by the shape of the head, the countenance, the complexion, the size of the brain, nor by any other bodily mark, can the man who will commit crime be identified. This baffles two sets of theorists, those who, like the late Mr. Cotter Morison, propose to get rid of crime by summarily putting to death such as are disposed to it, and those who wish to treat criminals as ill-starred and irresponsible beings, objects not of righteous resentment but of pity and the tenderest care. Criminals in the main are simply people who give way to temptations which other people resist. Their progress in crime is usually gradual, which shows that they set out like other people with a moral sense over which their evil passions or propensities are by degrees allowed to prevail. Education and circumstance of course make an enormous difference and must in the eye of God indefinitely diminish guilt; but even the pupils of Fagan know that they are doing what the community condemns, otherwise they would not run away from the police. The argument against capital punishment on the ground of irresistible predisposition would be equally applicable to all punishment, and in every case alike it is met by the retort of Bishop Butler: if the murderer is but the instrument of fate so is the hangman. We are not particular about names, and if those who object to the name of justice, as implying free-will on the part of the community, prefer that of "social reaction against

crime," we are content to let them have their way, provided that social reaction against wilful murder takes the form of setting the murderer on a scaffold with a halter round his neck and suddenly withdrawing the bolt. It is a good feature at all events in the new Act of the State of New York that it transfers the keeping of the condemned in the intervals before their execution from the local to the central prison, where it is to be hoped they will not be quite so open to morning calls, donations of flowers, and other tributes of the maudlin sentimentality which, as the example of the Rousseauists teaches us, is often as little connected with real tenderness of heart as it is with good sense, and which can only pervert the mind of the criminal by masking from him his real position. If this is a moral world, genuine kindness to the condemned would lead us to let him be fully sensible of the awfulness both of his act and of its punishment, that he may prepare himself as well as he can to go before the Court of Divine Justice.

—It is commonly stated on contemporary and respectable authority that seventy thousand persons suffered the death penalty during the thirty-eight years of the reign of Henry VIII., and the statement, incredible as it seems, derives some confirmation from a document preserved by Strype, in which a justice of the peace complains of the laxity with which the law is administered in his county though forty malefactors had been put to death there in a year. Madame de Sévigné, in letters overflowing with sensibility towards people of her class, talks with revolting levity of scores of peasants hanged or broken on the wheel. The modes of execution were not less barbarous than the numbers of victims were appalling. The details of the execution of Damien for slightly wounding Louis XV. sicken the reader, yet over that hellish spectacle gloated the rank and fashion of France. We may thank Heaven at all events for the progress of humanity, even when humanity, running into humanitarianism, assumes grotesque and irrational forms.

There can be no doubt that the adoption of "electrocution," as it is called, by a name not less hideous than the thing, instead of hanging, had for its motive humanity. The result however has been a scene at once ridiculous and revolting at which, and at every incident of which, two hemispheres have looked on, for the clause of the Act forbidding the publication of details has, as might have been expected, been totally set at naught. In the days of barbarism a brutal crowd gathered to see an execution: in our more civilized days the whole community is brutalized by an elaborate report embracing not only the bodily pangs of death but the moral tortures which precede it, and which in Kemmler's case appear to have been enhanced in the attempt to relieve them by concealing from the doomed man the hour fixed for his execution. After divers experiments in the abolition of capital punishment, the world seems to have come round to the conclusion that nothing will prevent murder but the terror of death; and if this is so, there is little reason in striving to divest death of all its terrors. Any one of the ordinary modes of execution is painless compared with the modes in which murderers usually kill their victims. Kemmler had chopped a woman to pieces with a hatchet. *Que messieurs les assassins commencent.* We do not want to torture the murderers, but we need not be at such desperate pains to make their exit from life more agreeable than they make ours. When a man has been convicted of a deliberate and perhaps mercenary murder, there is a good deal to be said for the ancient practice of hanging him, provided it be done with solemnity, and that the reporters be kept under real control.

•

—To punish us, we suppose, for our irreverent treatment of Mr. Cabot Lodge some one sends us *The Illustrated American*, a journal of high typographical pretensions, with as laboriously venomous a libel on British character as we remember ever to have read. The paper, though styled American, and bearing on its cover the eagle screaming at the uni-

verse, shows signs of Hebrew ownership or inspiration. But this would only add to the significance of the article. The Hebrew studies the market and he finds that what suits the American market is Anglophobia. Of course he seasons high. An Englishman, according to this writer, is never really "a gentleman;" he never possesses the refinement of character, the delicacy of taste, the grace of manner and the freedom from ostentation in the use of wealth which the writer and his compatriots display. Moreover, unlike them, he is given to "making his pile and skipping," to carrying his country upon the sole of his foot. American Anglophobia is a thing the existence of which some may be ashamed to admit, but no one who knows the American Press can seriously deny. Mr. Carnegie, who affects to treat it as an illusion, himself actually feeds it by his irrational and demagogic invective against aristocratic and monarchical institutions. Though disagreeable, it is not dangerous, so long as the question is merely between Great Britain and the United States. It only makes the negotiations about the Fisheries and Behring Sea more acrimonious and tedious than they would be if Great Britain were not concerned. The danger will arise if Great Britain goes to war with any European Power, especially Russia, to which the Americans have always shown a singular and somewhat servile attachment, winking hard at Poland and Siberia, while they passed resolutions of sympathy with oppressed Ireland. Anglophobia would then too probably tempt to breaches of neutrality which a popular government would have neither the wish nor the power to control. That the most offensive manifestations of Anglophobia are not genuine expressions of American feeling, but hypocritical tributes to the Irish vote, is true; but this would not mend the matter. A war between Great Britain and Russia or France would be the opportunity of the Clan-na-Gael. It bodes ill for the success of the Peace Society that the Geneva arbitration has had little effect upon American sentiment even as regards the particular injuries for which so full an atonement was made.

—John Henry Newman, now restored by death from the Cardinalate to humanity, was a man of the highest moral and spiritual aspirations, of rare intellectual gifts, of fine sensibilities and of exquisite culture. The example and influence of a life in which these were displayed are his contributions to the store of mankind. His intellect was rather keen and subtle than powerful and robust. His training included no science, nor anything which could take the place of science, like mathematics or the critical study of history. Philosophy he had studied; but in the school of Aristotle and under strong theological influence. Thus he was well-equipped both by nature and education for literature, devotional and general, but not so well-equipped for the pursuit of truth. Truth, indeed, in the strict sense of the term, he never pursued, though he earnestly strove to attain the best system for the salvation of souls. What he set out to seek, in his "Tracts for the Times," was not truth but a basis for clerical authority independent of the State, the power of which was falling into the hands of Liberals and Dissenters. That basis he found in Apostolic Succession and the power of the Sacraments, with which he combined a vision created by his own poetic imagination, with little reference to history, of the Medieval Church. The training which he underwent in building up his Catholic theory of the English Church, propagating it and accommodating the facts of history to it, was not favourable to his intellectual veracity. It was hardly possible that any man of intellect should sincerely believe that the doctrine and ritual of a State Church, formally designated by the State as Protestant, had remained without interruption Catholic, that the Prayer Book not the Articles was the canon of doctrine, that the Articles meant the opposite of what they plainly said, and that the Reformation had been the act of the clergy and not of the Royal Will. Newman's hollow theory, of course, at last broke down under him; the more ardent of his disciples, such as Ward, pressed on to the logical conclusion; and one day he found himself on his knees before a Roman priest praying for admission to the Church to

which Apostolic Succession, the High Church view of the Sacraments, and priestly authority belonged. He took the step as we suspect reluctantly; for he could hardly fail to enjoy his brilliant leadership of the Tractarian party and probably had a vision of the Church of England restored to Catholicism by his teaching and under him reunited to Catholic Christendom. But having taken the step he showed the usual zeal of the neophyte, flung himself into the most extreme Romanism, attacked both with argument and mockery the Church which he had left, and did despite to his reason by frantically proclaiming his belief in the most monstrous legends and impostures, such as the liquefaction of the blood of St. Januarius, the House of Loretto and the Holy Coat of Treves. We may surmise that he provoked the smile of an old-stager like Cardinal Wiseman, and still more of an old-stager like Cardinal Antonelli. But this mood in time subsided. Newman, no doubt, soon found that the modern Rome of the Jesuits was a very different thing from the Church of the Middle Ages, far more from his poetic reproduction of it. When the Vatican Council was held Newman was found formally accepting Papal Infallibility but practically paring it down to nothing. The old-stagers viewed him with suspicion, and preferred to his high philosophies of Development, wisely after their generation, the low and safe ambition of Manning. The "Apologia," which like most autobiographies is full of self-deception, seems to show that the autobiographer was not entirely at peace with his own intellect. The "Grammar of Assent" furnishes an apparatus for quieting your belief of things of which there is not sufficient evidence and of the truth of which you do not at heart feel assured. That Newman reconciled himself as he did with the Anglicans and Oxford may have been merely a proof of softened feeling, combined with literary sympathy; but it may also have been an indication of his having grown less confident that there was no truth or salvation out of the pale of Rome. He however accepted the Cardinal's hat which, having been withheld by Pio Nono,

was conferred by that fanatic's more liberal and statesmanlike successor, and whatever may have been working in a mind by nature restless and sceptical he remained outwardly a devout son and an exemplary prince of the Papacy. From the spectacle of a gifted intellect and a fine nature thus perverted to the service of a reactionary chimera and prostrated before the Holy Coat of Treves, the moral to be drawn is that whatever doubts may beset us and whatever storms of controversy may shake the world around us, our only hope is to remain firm in our allegiance to the truth. Whether weak man finds the truth cannot possibly signify to Omnipotence. The only thing which can possibly signify to Omnipotence, and which, if this is a moral world, does signify, is whether he seeks it.

—In Ruskin we shall lose the high-priest of the Beautiful: of the beautiful in Painting and Architecture: to Sculpture he paid less attention, his genius having been cast in the medieval and religious, not in the classical mould, while statuary belongs to Greece, and is even in the eyes of medievalists tainted with heathen worship of the body. As a critic of particular works of Art or particular masters, we must leave him to the judgment of experts, who, we believe, do not bow to his authority: certainly he is variable in his criticism as well as extreme, and in his antipathies sometimes extravagant. But more than any other man he has taught us to love and study beauty; beyond any of his contemporaries, perhaps beyond any other writer, he has opened its mysteries to us; the enhanced delight in it and the growing passion for possessing embodiments of it, which are everywhere seen, even in these commercial communities of the New World, we owe in great measure to him. We owe to him likewise a deeper and more intelligent appreciation of the beauties of nature, which he opened to us through the study of Art. His insight and enthusiasm were seconded, and he was able to propagate his æsthetic religion, by an incomparable gift of descriptive language, which has placed him high

among English writers and on a level with the other two great masters of our tongue in his day, Macaulay and Carlyle, though on a pedestal of a widely different kind. Above all other teachers of æsthetics he has connected the æsthetic with the ethical. The "Seven Lamps of Architecture" is in its way unique as well as exquisite. Probably, like most discoverers and enthusiasts, he carried his theory too far. History would have told him that genius for Art may exist apart from virtue. His Venice, at the very time when she produced St. Mark and the rest of the "Stones," was a city of harlots, and his own Turner was as far as possible from being ethically the counterpart of his divine works. Yet exaggeration does not annul truth, and the connection of the Beautiful with the Moral is a truth the profound significance of even Ruskin's pen has not exhausted. In virtue of his power of enforcing and illustrating morality in its æsthetic aspect, Ruskin may be numbered among the moral teachers of the age. It was the sense of his power in this respect, probably, that at last tempted him to leave the domain of which he was monarch, and, laying comparatively aside Art Criticism and the Philosophy of Beauty, to assume the part of a Social and Economic Prophet. In that field, alien to his gifts and his training, he still had a following, even an enthusiastic following. This he owed not only to the talisman of his style but to the loftiness and fervour of his own social aspirations, seconded though they were neither by special aptitude nor by knowledge. He had contracted a dangerous belief in his own infallibility and he forgot that if intuition has a place in æsthetics, in politics and in economics it has none. It is needless to dwell on the difference in value between his writings on his own subject and those in which his æsthetic soul dashed itself almost insanely against the tendencies of a scientific and economic age. Towards the end probably some of his utterances had begun to betray the progress of the disease to which he succumbs. If the poetic youth of the world is over, and its scientific manhood has come, the last pulse of youth could hardly have found more admirable expression than in the writings of John Ruskin.

—In the present century the influence of Germany has made itself felt not merely in the sphere of arms and politics, but also in nearly every department of thought and culture. Not least in the domain of Shakespearean scholarship have German ways of thinking been potent in marking out the lines and methods of work. This influence has not been wholly beneficial, although much is due to German diligence and German examples. The prevailing bent towards generalizations and abstractions has, doubtless, in some measure, turned the study of Shakespeare from its proper objects and given birth to much that is useless and a good deal that is absurd. Against this false tendency, Professor Corson's recently published *Introduction to Shakespeare* protests, and seeks to exemplify truer and more fruitful aims and methods. Much German criticism is occupied, for example, with establishing such theses as that Shakespeare's aim in writing the *Merchant of Venice* is to show forth man's relations to property, or to exemplify the legal maxim, *summum jus summa injuria*; that *Romeo and Juliet* is intended to instil the lesson of moderation; that *Coriolanus* is a political pamphlet to expose the weakness of democracy; while *The Tempest* is an allegorical presentation of contemporary history. It might be hinted that if such be the purpose of these dramas, they are striking failures. Many generations have enjoyed the power and beauty of *Romeo and Juliet* or *The Merchant of Venice* without carrying away the lesson. Nay, if *Romeo and Juliet* be a warning against the impetuosity of passion, the poet has awkwardly aroused our sympathies on the wrong side. It is certainly more complimentary to Shakespeare's power to suppose that the effects at which he aimed were those actually realized on the audiences gathered at the Globe Theatre and on the majority of his hearers and readers since—the pleasure and elevation of feeling roused by the contemplation of human personages depicted with unflinching fidelity, and of human passions displayed in their highest manifestations.

What we know of Shakespeare's life and of himself, what the candid student can gather from his works, all goes to show that he wrote to please. His audiences wished to have their interests awakened and their feelings kindled by representations of human life. They did not go to the theatre to be taught lessons in moderation, or the principles of law or government; nor is there anything to show that the poet, on his side, had any bent towards the didactic or any desire to unfold philosophical ideas. Shakespeare was indeed primarily artistic. His mind did not work by processes of reasoning. He did not first grasp abstract truths and then proceed to illustrate them by concrete examples. It was the concrete world that interested him. He lived and saw and felt rather than studied and reasoned. "When the transcendent power of the Plays is considered," says Mr. Corson, "the learning, strictly speaking, which is exhibited in them, is surprisingly little. The Plays bear more emphatic testimony than do any other masterpieces of genius, to the fact that great creative power may be triumphantly exercised *without* learning (I mean the learning of the schools)." Shakespeare's works afford quite remarkable evidence of his lack of bookishness, of his disregard of the student's point of view. His false geography and history prove great ignorance or great indifference—probably both. If it be argued that he shared that indifference to historical accuracy with his age, this only shows how ages differ and how unsafe it is to transfer from our own time to his either the historic sense, or the tendency towards generalizations and abstractions. But if the age of Elizabeth had but little of our passion for the generalizations of experience, it had, in a degree far beyond us, the desire for representations of concrete life. And for the gratification of that desire, no one could have been better qualified than Shakespeare. Shakespeare had the fundamental requisite for artistic work, the power to see and to feel. He also had the second—the power to reproduce his perceptions in an artistic medium, so that others can share them. The best study and criticism of Shakespeare

is that which enables us to do this. Analytic methods are good only so far as they contribute to this result—so far as they open our eyes to the significance and richness of his pictures. They are but the scaffolding which we erect to get a nearer view of the building; when this has served its end it must be got rid of; we must fall back and take in the structure as a whole. If we wish to look at Shakespeare's plays as he looked at them, we must consider them concretely, as embodiments of life, not of abstract principles. The best commentary on a play of Shakespeare is to see it well put on the stage. Of course, the actor's interpretation is always inadequate, often faulty, not seldom positively false. The true lover of Shakespeare will accordingly find usually a keener delight in reading the plays for himself. His perceptions are probably finer than the best actor's, as actors usually go, and there is besides much subtle beauty and power which no stage rendering can reveal, which need the leisure and microscopic examination of the study. Notwithstanding, the pleasure afforded by the truest appreciation of Shakespeare is of the same kind as that which the theatre-goer gets, and the true way to regard Shakespeare is as a delineator of human life, not as a theorizer upon it.

What then are we to say of the philosophic truths which have been drawn from Shakespeare's plays, and of the lofty moral lessons which seem to be so patent in many of them? Are these non-existent—arbitrarily read into the plays by the critics? No; they are implicit. The great principles of morality are generalizations of experience amended and confirmed by the observation of successive generations. And as Shakespeare's work is the result of unwonted clearness of vision for the facts of nature and life, so those great fundamental principles underlie his plays, as they underlie the events of the actual world. Shakespeare's work is profoundly wholesome. He neither misrepresents nature, in the fear of undermining, or with the aim of encouraging what the sense of men call right, nor for a moment does he blink the stern penalty which is exacted on the inner nature, though often not on the external

fortune of the weakling and the evil-doer. "Shakespeare is always, and pre-eminently, and exclusively, the dramatist; but as a dramatist he is distinguished from all the contemporary dramatists, in his working more strictly than any of them under the condition of moral proportion (and by moral proportion I mean that which is in harmony with the permanent constitution, with the eternal fitness of things), and this he did because, as must be inferred, he felt more than did any other of the contemporary dramatists the constitution of things, and knew that the constitution of things could not be violated with impunity. To unite moral proportion with a more or less unrestrained play of the passions is the great artistic achievement of Shakespeare, in his tragic masterpieces. And when a critic looks into his plays with an eye for the doctrinal, he can easily find it there, because the best results of human philosophy in its several departments have been induced and deduced from careful observations of the permanent constitution of things, and therefore correspond more or less with the philosophy concretely embodied in the plays. The concrete philosophy and the abstract philosophy are based on, or derived from, the same permanent constitution of things.

—THE BYSTANDER has already explained that the object of the series which this number closes was to fill, as well as we could, a dangerous gap in the advocacy of a commercial policy which we hold to be essential to the interests of the whole Dominion and absolutely vital to these of the North-West. For the general objects which THE BYSTANDER was originally intended to promote, independence in the discussion of public affairs and interest in literary questions, provision is now happily made on a larger scale by the growth of an independent press and by the establishment of a literary journal. We are glad to hear that *The Week* is likely to be re-stocked and sent forth on its course with renewed vigour. The effort to give Canadian intellect an organ in the shape of a magazine or a

literary paper has been arduous and costly ; much labour has been expended on it, not, presumably, without sacrifice of other work, nor has its course been unchequered by failure. The area is small and poor, being practically confined to Ontario and Montreal, and there is no use in denying the fact that the literary products of a dependency are at a discount in the dependency itself. The struggle against the literary journalism of the mother country and still more against that of the United States is almost desperate. But those who have taken part repine neither at the expenditure of money and labour nor at the limited character of the success. Whatever political destiny may be in store for us, whether Ontario is always to remain apart or to be united with the English-speaking race of this continent, there is no reason why she should not be made and always remain a centre of intellectual life. Those who have been unsparing in their efforts to bring this about may fairly plead that they have shown patriotism in their way, albeit their way may not be that of the Jingo. One at least, though perhaps not the most important of the elements of nationality, they have done what was in their power to produce.

This book should be returned to
the Library on or before the last date
stamped below.

A fine of five cents a day is incurred
by retaining it beyond the specified
time.

Please return promptly.

239
CANCELLED
4 69 H



3 2044 100 136 381